

AN EXACT EXPOSITION
OF THE ORTHODOX FAITH

BOOK I

Chapter I

NO MAN HATH SEEN GOD at any time: the only-begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.¹ The God-head, then, is ineffable and incomprehensible. For 'no one knoweth the Father, but the Son: neither doth any one know the Son, but the Father.'² Furthermore, the Holy Spirit knows the things of God, just as the spirit of man knows what is in man.³ After the first blessed state of nature, no one has ever known God unless God Himself revealed it to him—not only no man, but not even any of the supramundane powers: the very Cherubim and Seraphim, I mean.

Nevertheless, God has not gone so far as to leave us in

¹ John 1.18.

² Matt. 11.27.

³ Cf. 1 Cor. 2.11.

complete ignorance, for through nature the knowledge of the existence of God has been revealed by Him to all men. The very creation of its harmony and ordering proclaims the majesty of the divine nature.⁴ Indeed, He has given us knowledge of Himself in accordance with our capacity, at first through the Law and the Prophets and then afterwards through His only-begotten Son, our Lord and God and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Accordingly, we accept all those things that have been handed down by the Law and the Prophets and the Apostles and the Evangelists, and we know and revere them, and over and above these things we seek nothing else. For, since God is good, He is the author of all good and is not subject to malice or to any affection. For malice is far removed from the divine nature, which is the unaffected and only good. Since, therefore, He knows all things and provides for each in accordance with his needs, He has revealed to us what it was expedient for us to know, whereas that which we were unable to bear He has withheld. With these things let us be content and in them let us abide and let us not step over the ancient bounds⁵ or pass beyond the divine tradition.

Chapter 2

Now, one who would speak or hear about God should know beyond any doubt that in what concerns theology and the Dispensation¹ not all things are inexpressible and not all are capable of expression, and neither are all things unknowable nor are they all knowable. That which can be known is one thing, whereas that which can be said is

⁴ Cf. Wisd. 13.5; Rom. 1.20.

⁵ Cf. Prov. 22.28.

¹ *οικονομία*, or Dispensation, is the term commonly used for the Incarnation by the Greek Fathers.

another, just as it is one thing to speak and another to know. Furthermore, many of those things about God which are not clearly perceived cannot be fittingly described, so that we are obliged to express in human terms things which transcend the human order. Thus, for example, in speaking about God we attribute to Him sleep, anger, indifference, hands and feet, and the alike.

Now, we both know and confess that God is without beginning and without end, everlasting and eternal, uncreated, unchangeable, inalterable, simple, uncompounded, incorporeal, invisible, impalpable, uncircumscribed, unlimited, incomprehensible, uncontained, unfathomable, good, just, the maker of all created things, all-powerful, all-ruling, all-seeing, the provider, the sovereign, and the judge of all. We furthermore know and confess that God is one, that is to say, one substance, and that He is both understood to be and is in three Persons—I mean the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost—and that the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost are one in all things save in the being unbegotten, the being begotten, and the procession. We also know and confess that for our salvation the Word of God through the bowels of His mercy, by the good pleasure of the Father and with the co-operation of the All-Holy Spirit, was conceived without seed and chastely begotten of the holy Virgin and Mother of God, Mary, by the Holy Ghost and of her became perfect man; and that He is perfect God and at the same time perfect man, being of two natures, the divinity and the humanity, and in two intellectual natures endowed with will and operation and liberty—or, to put it simply, perfect in accordance with the definition and principle befitting each, the divinity, I mean, and the humanity, but with one compound hypostasis. And we know and confess that He hungered and thirsted and was weary, and that He was crucified, and that for three days He suffered death and the tomb, and that He returned into heaven whence He had come to us and whence He will come back to us at

a later time. To all this holy Scripture and all the company of the saints bear witness.

But what the substance of God is, or how it is in all things, or how the only-begotten Son, who was God, emptied Himself out and became man from a virgin's blood, being formed by another law that transcended nature, or how He walked dry-shod upon the waters, we neither understand nor can say.² And so it is impossible either to say or fully to understand anything about God beyond what has been divinely proclaimed to us, whether told or revealed, by the sacred declarations of the Old and New Testaments.

Chapter 3

Now, the fact that God exists is not doubted by those who accept the sacred Scriptures—both the Old and New Testaments, I mean—nor by the majority of the Greeks, for, as we have said, the knowledge of God's existence has been revealed to us through nature. However, since the wickedness of the Evil One has so prevailed over men's nature as even to drag some of them down to the most unspeakable and extremely wicked abyss of perdition and to make them say that there is no God (of whose folly the Prophet David said: 'The fool hath said in his heart: There is no God'¹), then the Lord's disciples and Apostles, made wise by the All-Holy Spirit, did by His power and grace show signs from God and draw up those people alive in the net of their miracles from the depths of the ignorance of God to the light of his knowledge. Similarly, the shepherds and teachers who succeeded to their grace of the Spirit and by the power of their miracles and the word of their grace enlightened those who were in darkness and converted those who were

² Cf. Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Divine Names* 2.9 (PG 3.648A).

¹ Ps. 13.1.

in error. Now, let us who have not received the gifts of miracles and teaching, because by our being given to material pleasures we have made ourselves unworthy, let us invoke the aid of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and discuss some few of the things which the expounders of grace have handed down to us.

All things are either created or uncreated. Now, if they are created, then they are also definitely changeable, for things whose being originated with a change are definitely subject to change, whether it be by corruption or by voluntary alteration. If, on the other hand, they are uncreated, then it logically follows that they are definitely unchangeable. For, of those things whose being is contrary, the manner of being, which is to say, properties, is also contrary. Who, then, will not agree that all beings that fall within our experience, including even the angels, are subject to change and alteration and to being moved in various ways? The intellectual beings—by which I mean angels and souls and demons—change by free choice, progressing in good or receding, exerting themselves or slackening; whereas the rest change by generation or corruption, increase or decrease, change in quality or change in position. Consequently, things which are changeable must definitely be created. Created beings have certainly been created by something. But the creator must be uncreated, for, if he has been created, then he has certainly been created by some one else—and so on until we arrive at something which has not been created. Therefore, the creator is an uncreated and entirely unchangeable being. And what else would that be but God?

What is more, the very harmony of creation, its preservation and governing, teach us that there is a God who has put all this together and keeps it together, ever maintaining it and providing for it. For how could such contrary natures as fire and water, earth and air, combine with one another to form one world and remain undissolved, unless there

were some all-powerful force to bring them together and always keep them that way?²

What is it that has ordered the things of heaven and those of earth, the things which move through the air and those which move in the water—nay, rather, the things which preceded them: heaven and earth and the natures of fire and water? What is it that combined and arranged them? What is it that set them in motion and put them on their unceasing and unhindered courses? Or is it that they had no architect to set a principle in them all by which the whole universe be moved and controlled? But who is the architect of these things? Or did not he who made them also bring them into being? We shall certainly not attribute such power to spontaneity. Even grant that they came into being spontaneously; then, whence came their arrangement? Let us grant this, also, if you wish. Then, what maintains and keeps the principles by which they subsisted in the first place? It is most certainly some other thing than mere chance. What else is this, if it is not God?³

Chapter 4

Thus, it is clear that God exists, but what He is in essence and nature is unknown and beyond all understanding. That He is without a body is obvious, for how could a body contain that which is limitless, boundless, formless, impalpable, invisible, simple, and uncompounded? How could it be immutable, if it were circumscribed and subject to change? And how could that which is composed of elements and reducible to them be not subject to change? Composition is the cause of conflict, conflict the cause of separation, and separation

2 Cf. Athanasius, *Against the Pagans* 35-36 (PG 25.69C-73A).

3 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 28.16 (PG 36.45D-48B).

the cause of dissolution—but dissolution is altogether foreign to God.¹

And again, how can the principle be maintained that God permeates and fills all things, as Scripture says: 'Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord'?² For it is impossible for one body to permeate others without dividing and being divided, without being blended and contrasted, just as when a number of liquids are mixed together and blended.³

Now, should some people speak of an immaterial body, the so-called fifth body of the Greek philosophers, which is impossible, then this will be subject to motion just like the heavens, which they call a fifth body. But, since everything that is moved is moved by another, then who is it that moves this? And who is it that moves that? And so we go on endlessly in this way until such time as we arrive at something that is immovable.⁴ For the first mover is unmoved, and it is just this that is the Divinity. Furthermore, how can that which is not locally contained be moved? Therefore, only the Divinity is unmoved, and by His immovability He moves all things. Consequently, one can only answer that the Divinity is without body.

All this, however, is by no means indicative of His essence—no more than is the fact of His being unbegotten, without beginning, immutable, and incorruptible, or any of those other things which are affirmed of God or about Him. These do not show what He is, but, rather, what He is not.⁵ One who would declare the essence of something must explain what it is, but not what it is not. However, as regards what God is, it is impossible to say what He is in His essence, so it is better to discuss Him by abstraction from all things

1 Cf. *ibid.* 7 (PG 36.33).

2 Jer. 23.24.

3 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 28.8 (PG 36.36A).

4 Cf. *ibid.* (PG 36.36AB).

5 Cf. *ibid.* (PG 36.36C-37B).

whatsoever. For He does not belong to the number of beings, not because He does not exist, but because He transcends all beings and being itself. And, if knowledge respects beings, then that which transcends knowledge will certainly transcend essence, and, conversely, what transcends essence will transcend knowledge.⁶

The Divinity, then, is limitless and incomprehensible, and this His limitlessness and incomprehensibility is all that can be understood about Him. All that we state affirmatively about God does not show His nature, but only what relates to His nature. And, if you should ever speak of good, or justice, or wisdom, or something else of the sort, you will not be describing the nature of God, but only things relating to His nature. There are, moreover, things that are stated affirmatively of God, but which have the force of extreme negation. For example, when we speak of darkness in God we do not really mean darkness.⁷ What we mean is that He is not light, because He transcends light. In the same way, when we speak of light we mean that it is not darkness.

Chapter 5

It has been sufficiently demonstrated that God exists and that His essence is incomprehensible. Furthermore, those who believe in sacred Scripture have no doubt that He is one and not several. For the Lord says at the beginning of His lawgiving: 'I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt. Thou shalt not have strange gods before me.'¹ And again: 'Hear, O Israel: the Lord thy God is one Lord.'² And through the mouth of the Prophet Isaias: 'I am,' He says, 'the first God and I am the last and there is no God

6 Cf. Pseudo-Dionysius, *Mystical Theology* 2 (PG 3.1000AB).

7 Cf. *ibid.* 1 (PG 3.1000A).

1 Exod. 20.2,3.

2 Deut. 6.4.

besides me. Before me there was no God and after me there shall be none, and beside me there is none."³ And the Lord speaks thus to His Father in the holy Gospels: "This is eternal life: that they may know thee, the only true God."⁴ With those who do not believe in sacred Scripture we shall reason as follows.

The Divinity is perfect and without deficiency in goodness or wisdom or power. He is without beginning, without end, eternal, uncircumscribed; to put it simply, He is perfect in all things. Now, if we say that there are several gods, there must be some difference to be found among them. For if there is no difference at all among them, then there is one God rather than several. But, if there is some difference, then where is the perfection? For, if one should come short of perfection in goodness, or power, or wisdom, or time, or place, then he would not be God. The identity of God in all things shows Him to be one and not several.⁵

And again, if there are several gods, how can one support the fact of God's being uncircumscribed? For where there is one there cannot be another.

And, since there is bound to be conflict among several governing, how can the world be governed by several gods without being broken up and utterly destroyed? Now, should any one say that each one rules over a part, then what was it that arranged for this and made the distribution among them? This last being would more likely be God. God, then, is one, perfect, uncircumscribed, the maker of the universe, the maintainer of order and governor, preceding and transcending all perfection.

Besides all this, it is naturally necessary that the originating principle of duality be unity.⁶

³ Isa. 43.10.

⁴ John 17.3.

⁵ Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *Cathetical Discourse*, Prologue (PG 45.12AD).

⁶ Cf. Pseudo-Dionysius, *Divine Names* 13.3 (PG 3.980-981).

Chapter 6

Now, this one sole God is not without a Word. And, if He has a Word, this Word will not be non-subsistent (ἀνυπόστατον), nor will it have any beginning or end of being. For there never was a time when God the Word was not. God always has His Word begotten of Himself—not like our speech, which is non-subsistent and dissipated in the air, but distinctly subsistent (ἐνυπόστατον), living and perfect, not passing out from Him but always existing within Him.¹ For where will He be if He is outside of God? Because our nature is mortal and subject to dissolution, for this reason our speech is non-subsistent. But, since God is existing always and is perfect, His Word must be always existing, living, perfect, distinctly subsistent, and having all things that His Begetter has. Now, our speech in proceeding from our mind is not entirely distinct from it. For, in so far as it comes from the mind, it is something distinct from it; whereas, in so far as it reveals the mind itself, it is not entirely distinct from it. Actually, it is identical with it in nature while distinct from it in its subject. Similarly, the Word of God, in so far as He subsists in Himself, is distinct from Him from whom He has His subsistence. But, since He exhibits in Himself those same things which are discerned in God, then in His nature He is identical with God. For, just as perfection in all things is to be found in the Father, so is it also to be found in the Word begotten of Him.

Chapter 7

It is further necessary that the Word have a Spirit. Thus, even our own speech is not devoid of breath, although in our case the breath is not of our substance. It is an inhaling and exhaling of the air which is breathed in and out for the

1 Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *op. cit.* 2 (PG 45.17BC).

sustainment of the body. It is this which on the occasion of articulation becomes the vocal expression of speech and evidences in itself the power of speech.¹ Now, in the simple and uncompounded divine nature the existence of a Spirit of God is piously to be confessed, for the Word of God is no more deficient than our own word. It would be impious to reckon the Spirit as something foreign to God and later introduced from outside, as is the case with us who are compounded. On the contrary, it is as when we heard there was a Word of God and did not conceive of this as not being distinctly subsistent, or as accruing from learning, or as being expressed vocally and being diffused in the air and lost. Rather, we conceived of Him as substantially subsisting, endowed with will and operation, and all-powerful. In the same way, too, having learned that there is a Spirit of God, we conceive of Him as associated with the Word and making the operation of the Word manifest. We do not conceive of Him as an impersonal breath of air, for the majesty of the divine nature would be reduced to low estate if its Spirit were likened to our own breath. Rather, we conceive of Him as a substantial power found in its own individuating personality, proceeding from the Father, coming to rest in the Word and declaring Him, not separated from God in essence or from the Word with whom it is associated, having might, not dissipated away into non-existence, but distinctly subsistent like the Word—living, endowed with will, self-moving, active, at all times willing good, exercising His power for the prosecution of every design in accordance with His will, without beginning and without end. For the Word fell short of the Father in nothing, and the Spirit did not fall short of the Word in anything.

Thus, on the one hand, the unity in nature exposes the polytheistic error of the Greeks; on the other hand, the doctrine of the Word and the Spirit demolishes the teaching of the Jews. At the same time, the good in both of these

1 Cf. *ibid.* 2 (PG 45.17A).

heresies remain: from the Jewish opinion the unity of nature; and from Hellenism the unique distinction according to persons.²

Should the Jew gainsay the doctrine of the Word and the Spirit, then let sacred Scripture refute him and reduce him to silence. Thus the divine David says concerning the Word: 'For ever, O Lord, thy word standeth firm in heaven.' And again: 'He sent his word and healed them.' But a spoken word is not sent and neither does it stand firm forever. Concerning the Spirit the same David says: 'Thou shalt send forth thy spirit, and they shall be created.' And again: 'By the word of the Lord the heavens were established and all the power of them by the spirit of his mouth.'³ Job likewise says: 'The spirit of God made me: and the breath of the Almighty maintaineth me.'⁴ Now a spirit which is sent, and acts, and strengthens, and maintains is not breath which is dissipated any more than the mouth of God is a bodily member. Both in fact are to be understood as appropriately referring to God.⁵

Chapter 8

Therefore, we believe in one God: one principle, without beginning, uncreated, unbegotten, indestructible and immortal, eternal, unlimited, uncircumscribed, unbounded, infinite in power, simple, uncompounded, incorporeal, unchanging, unaffected, unchangeable, inalterate, invisible, source of goodness and justice, light intellectual and inaccessible; power which no measure can give any idea of but which is measured only by His own will, for He can do all things whatsoever He pleases;¹ maker of all things both visible and invisible,

² Cf. *ibid.* 3 (PG 45.17D-20A).

³ Ps. 118.89; 106.20; 32.6.

⁴ Job 33.4.

⁵ Cf. Basil, *The Holy Ghost* 18.46 (PG 32.152B).

¹ Ps. 134.6.

holding together all things and conserving them, provider for all, governing and dominating and ruling over all in unending and immortal reign; without contradiction, filling all things, contained by nothing, but Himself containing all things, being their conservator and first possessor; pervading all substances without being defiled, removed far beyond all things and every substance as being supersubstantial and surpassing all, supereminently divine and good and replete; appointing all the principalities and orders, set above every principality and order, above essence and life and speech and concept; light itself and goodness and being in so far as having neither being nor anything else that is from any other; the very source of being for all things that are, of life to the living, of speech to the articulate, and the cause of all good things for all; knowing all things before they begin to be; one substance, one godhead, one virtue, one will, one operation, one principality, one power, one domination, one kingdom; known in three perfect Persons and adored with one adoration, believed in and worshiped by every rational creature, united without confusion and distinct without separation, which is beyond understanding. We believe in Father and Son and Holy Ghost in whom we have been baptized. For it is thus that the Lord enjoined the Apostles: 'Baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.'²

We believe in one Father, the principle and cause of all things, begotten of no one, who alone is uncaused and unbegotten, the maker of all things and by nature Father of His one and only-begotten Son, our Lord and God and Saviour, Jesus Christ, and Emitter³ of the All-Holy Spirit. We also believe in one Son of God, the only-begotten, our Lord Jesus Christ, who was begotten of the Father before all the ages, light from light, true God from true God, begotten not made, consubstantial with the Father, by whom all

² Matt. 28.19.

³ προβαλεύς, Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 29.2 (PG 36.76B).

things were made; in regard to whom, when we say that He is before all ages, we mean that His begetting is outside of time and without beginning, for the Son of God was not brought from nothing into being; who is the brightness of the glory and the figure of the substance of the Father, His living power and wisdom, the subsistent Word, the substantial and perfect and living image of the invisible God.⁴ Actually, He was always with the Father, being begotten of Him eternally and without beginning. For the Father never was when the Son was not, but the Father and the Son begotten of Him exist together simultaneously, because the Father could not be so called without a Son. Now, if He was not Father when He did not have the Son, and then later became Father without having been Father before, then He was changed from not being Father to being Father, which is the worst of all blasphemies. For it is impossible to speak of God as naturally lacking the power of begetting. And the power of begetting is the power to beget of oneself, that is, of one's own substance, offspring similar to oneself in nature.

Accordingly, it is impious to say that time intervened in the begetting of the Son and that the Son came into existence after the Father.⁵ For we say that the begetting of the Son is of the Father, that is to say, of His nature; and if we do not grant that the Son begotten of the Father exists together with Him from the beginning, then we are introducing a change into the substance of the Father: namely, that He once was not Father, but became Father later. Now, creation, even if it was made at a later time, was not of the substance of God, but was brought from nothing into being by His will and power and does not involve any change in the nature of God. Begetting means producing of the substance of the begetter an offspring similar in substance to the begetter. Creation, on the other hand—making—is the bringing into being, from the outside and not from

⁴ Heb. 1.3; 1 Cor. 1.24; Col. 1.15.

⁵ Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 20.7 (PG 35.1073B).

the substance of the creator, of something created and made entirely dissimilar [in substance].

Therefore, neither the act of begetting nor that of creation has any effect on the one, unaffected, unvarying, unchanging, and ever-the-same God. For, being simple and uncompounded and, consequently, by nature unaffected and unchanging, He is by nature not subject to passion or change, whether from begetting or from creating, nor does He stand in need of any co-operation. On the contrary, because the begetting is an action belonging to His nature and proceeding from His substance, it is without beginning and eternal, so that the Begetter undergoes no change and so that He is not a first God and a later God, but receives no addition. But, since with God creation is a work of His will, it is not co-eternal with Him—which is because it is not of the nature of that which is produced from nothing to be co-eternal with that which is without beginning and always existing. Indeed, God and man do not make in the same way.⁶ Thus, man does not bring anything from non-being into being. What man makes he makes from already existing material, not by just willing but by thinking it out beforehand and getting an idea of what he is to make and then working with his hands, toiling and troubling and oftentimes failing because the object of his endeavor does not turn out as he wished. God, on the other hand, has brought all things from nothing into being by a mere act of His will. Hence, God and man do not beget in the same way. For, since God is without time and without beginning, unaffected, unchanging, incorporeal, unique, and without end,⁷ He begets without time and without beginning, unaffectedly, unchangingly, and without copulation. Neither does His unfathomable begetting have beginning or end. It is without beginning, because He is immutable; it is unchanging, because He is unaffected and incorporeal; it is without copulation, also because He

6 Cf. *ibid.* (PG 35.1076CD).

7 Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *Thesaurus*, Assert. 5 (PG 75.60CD).

is incorporeal and because He is the only one God and without need of any other; it is unending and unceasing, because He is without time and without end and ever the same—for that which is without beginning is without end, although that which is without end by a gift of grace is by no means without beginning, as is the case with the angels.

Accordingly, the ever-existing God begets without beginning and without end His own Word as a perfect being, lest God, whose nature and existence are outside of time, should beget in time. Now, it is obvious that man begets in quite another manner, since he is subject to birth and death and flux and increase, and since he is clothed with a body and has the male and female in his nature—for the male has need of the female's help. May He be propitious to us who is beyond all things and surpasses all understanding and comprehension.

Therefore, the holy Catholic and apostolic Church teaches that the Father exists simultaneously with His only-begotten Son, who is begotten of Him without time or change or passion and in a manner beyond understanding, as only the God of all knows. They exist simultaneously, as does the fire with its light—without the fire being first and the light afterwards, but both simultaneously. And just as the light is ever being begotten of the fire, is always in it, and is in no way separated from it, so also is the Son begotten of the Father without in any way being separated from Him, but always existing in Him. However, the light, which is inseparably begotten of the fire and always remains in it, does not have any individual existence apart from the fire, because it is a natural quality of the fire. On the other hand, the only-begotten Son of God, who was inseparably and indivisibly begotten of the Father and abides in Him always, does have His own individual existence apart from that of the Father.

Now the Word is also called 'Brightness'⁸ because He was begotten of the Father without copulation, without passion,

⁸ Heb. 1.3.

without time, without change, and without separation. He is also called 'Son' and 'Figure of the substance of the Father'⁹ because He is perfect and distinctly subsistent and in all things like the Father except in the Father's being unbegotten. And He is called 'Only-begotten' because He alone was begotten alone of the only Father. For neither is there any other begetting like that of the Son of God, nor is there any other Son of God. Thus, although the Holy Ghost does proceed from the Father, this is not by begetting but by procession. This is another manner of existence and is just as incomprehensible and unknowable as is the begetting of the Son. Hence, the Son has all things whatsoever the Father has, except the Father's being unbegotten, which does not imply any difference in substance, nor any quality, but, rather, a manner of existence.¹⁰ Thus, in the same way, Adam is unbegotten, because he was formed by God, while Seth is begotten, because he is the son of Adam; Eve, too, was not begotten, because she was produced from the rib of Adam. Yet, they do not differ in nature, because they are all human beings; they only differ in the manner of their existence.¹¹

Now, one ought to know that ἀγένητον written with one ν means that which has not been created, or, in other words, that which is unoriginated; while ἀγέννητον written with two ν's means that which has not been begotten. Therefore, the first meaning implies a difference in essence, for it means that one essence is uncreated, or ἀγένητος with one ν, while some other is created, or originated. On the other hand, the second meaning does not imply any difference in essence, because the first individual substance of every species of living being is unbegotten but not unoriginated. For they were created by the Creator, being brought into existence by His Word. But they were certainly not begotten,

9 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 30.20 (PG 36.128B-129B).

10 Cf. Basil, *Against Eunomius* 4 (PG 29.680D-681A).

11 Cf. *ibid.* (PG 29.681B); Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 31.11 (PG 36.144D-145A).

because there was no other like substance pre-existing from which they might have been begotten.

Thus, the first meaning applies to all three of the super-divine Persons of the sacred Godhead, for they are uncreated and of the same substance.¹² On the other hand, the second meaning definitely does not apply to all three, because the Father alone is unbegotten in so far as He does not have His being from another person. And only the Son is begotten, for He is begotten of the substance of the Father without beginning and independently of time. And only the Holy Ghost proceeds: not begotten, but proceeding from the substance of the Father. Such is the teaching of sacred Scripture, but as to the manner of the begetting and the procession, this is beyond understanding.

This also should be known, that the terms 'paternity,' 'sonship,' and 'procession' as applied to the blessed Godhead did not originate with us, but, on the contrary, were handed down to us from Scripture, as the divine Apostle says: 'For this cause I bow my knee to the Father, of whom all paternity in heaven and earth is named.'¹³

And if we say that the Father is the principle of the Son and greater than the Son, we are not giving to understand that He comes before the Son either in time or in nature, for 'by him he made the world,'¹⁴ nor in any other thing save causality. That is to say, we mean that the Son is begotten of the Father, and not the Father of the Son, and that the Father is naturally the cause of the Son. Similarly, we do not say that the fire comes from the light, but that the light comes from the fire. So, when we hear that the Father is the principle of the Son and greater than He, let us understand this as being by reason of His being the cause. And just as we do not say that the fire is of one substance and the light of another, neither is it proper to say that the

12 Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *Thesaurus*, Assert. 7 (PG 75.24AC).

13 Eph. 3.14,15.

14 Heb. 1.2.

Father is of one substance and the Son of another; on the contrary, they are of one and the same substance. What is more, just as we say that the fire is made visible by the light coming from it, yet do not make the fire's light a subsidiary organ of the fire but, rather, a natural power; in the same way, we say that the Father does all things whatsoever through His only-begotten Son, not as through a subsidiary organ, but as through a natural and distinctly subsistent force. And just as we say that the fire gives light, and, again, that the fire's light gives light, so: 'What things soever the Father doth, these the Son also doth in like manner.'¹⁵ But the light was not created an individual substance apart from the fire, whereas the Son is a perfect individual substance inseparable from that of the Father, as we have set forth above. For it is impossible to find in creation any image which exactly portrays the manner of the Holy Trinity in Itself. For that which is created is also compounded, variable, changeable, circumscribed, having shape, and corruptible; so, how shall it show with any clarity the supersubstantial divine essence which is far removed from all such? It is evident that all creation is subject to these several conditions and that it is of its own nature subject to corruption.

We likewise believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceeds from the Father and abides in the Son; who is adored and glorified together with the Father and the Son as consubstantial and co-eternal with Them; who is the true and authoritative Spirit of God and the source of wisdom and life and sanctification; who is God together with the Father and the Son and is so proclaimed; who is uncreated, complete, creative, almighty, all-working, all-powerful, infinite in power; who dominates all creation but is not dominated; who deifies but is not deified; who fills but is not filled; who is shared in but does not share; who sanctifies but is not sanctified; who,

¹⁵ John 5.19.

as receiving the intercessions of all, is the Intercessor; who is like the Father and the Son in all things; who proceeds from the Father and is communicated through the Son and is participated in by all creation; who through Himself creates and gives substance to all things and sanctifies and preserves them; who is distinctly subsistent and exists in His own Person indivisible and inseparable from the Father and the Son; who has all things whatsoever the Father and the Son have except the being unbegotten and the being begotten. For the Father is uncaused and unbegotten, because He is not from anything, but has His being from Himself and does not have from any other anything whatsoever that He has. Rather, He Himself is the principle and cause by which all things naturally exist as they do. And the Son is begotten of the Father, while the Holy Ghost is Himself also of the Father—although not by begetting, but by procession. Now, we have learned that there is a difference between begetting and procession, but what the manner of this difference is we have not learned at all. However, the begetting of the Son and the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father are simultaneous.

Accordingly, all things whatsoever the Son has from the Father the Spirit also has, including His very being. And if the Father does not exist, then neither does the Son or the Spirit; and if the Father does not have something, then neither has the Son or the Spirit. Furthermore, because of the Father, that is, because of the fact that the Father is, the Son and the Spirit are; and because of the Father, the Son and the Spirit have everything that they have, that is to say, because of the fact that the Father has them, excepting the being unbegotten, the begetting, and the procession. For it is only in these personal properties that the three divine Persons differ from one another, being indivisibly divided by the distinctive note of each individual Person.

We say that each of the three has perfect distinct subsistence; not, however, in such a way as to understand

one perfect nature compounded of three imperfect natures, but one simple essence, eminently and antecedently perfect, in three Persons.¹⁶ For, anything that is made up of imperfect things is most definitely compounded, and it is impossible for there to be a compound of perfect individual substances. Hence, we do not say that the species is of the Persons, but in the Persons. Those things which do not retain the species of the thing made of them we call imperfect. Thus, stone, wood, and iron are each perfect in themselves according to their individual natures; but in relation to a house built of them they are all imperfect, because no one of them by itself is a house.

And so we speak of perfect individual substances to avoid giving any idea of composition in the divine nature. For composition is the cause of disintegration. And again, we say that the three Persons are in one another, so as not to introduce a whole swarm of gods.¹⁷ By the three Persons we understand that God is uncompounded and without confusion; by the consubstantiality of the Persons and their existence in one another and by the indivisibility of the identity of will, operation, virtue, power, and, so to speak, motion we understand that God is one. For God and His Word and His Spirit are really one God.

*[On the Distinction of the Three Persons; and on Actuality and Reason and Thought.]*¹⁸

One should know that it is one thing actually to observe something and another to see it through reason and thought. Thus, in all creatures there is an actual distinction to be seen between the individual substances. Peter is seen to be actually distinct from Paul. But, that which is held in common, the connection, and the unity is seen by reason and thought.

16 Cf. *Basil, Against the Sabellians, Arians, and Eumomians* 4 (PG 31.605BC).

17 Cf. *ibid.* (PG 31.605C); Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 38.8 (PG 36.320B).

18 This is a marginal addition to the manuscript.

Thus, in our mind we see that Peter and Paul are of the same nature and have one common nature, for each is a rational mortal animal and each is a body animated by a rational and understanding soul. Hence, this common nature is perceived by the reason. Now, individual persons do not exist in one another at all, but each one is separate and by itself, that is to say, is distinct and considered in itself, since it has a great many things to distinguish it from the other. For, truly, they are separated in place and they differ in time, judgment, strength, form—or shape, habit, temperament, dignity, manner of life, and all the other distinctive properties—but most of all they differ by the fact that they do not exist in each other but separately. Hence, we speak of two, or three, or several men.

The aforesaid is true of all creation, but it is quite the contrary in the case of the holy, supersubstantial, all-transcendent, and incomprehensible Trinity. For, here, that which is common and one is considered in actuality by reason of the co-eternity and identity of substance, operation, and will, and by reason of the agreement in judgment and the identity of power, virtue, and goodness—I did not say *similarity*, but *identity*—and by reason of the one surge of motion. For there is one essence, one goodness, one virtue, one intent, one operation, one power—one and the same, not three similar one to another, but one and the same motion of the three Persons. And the oneness of each is not less with the others than it is with itself, that is to say, the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost are one in all things except the being unbegotten, the being begotten, and the procession. It is by thought that the distinction is perceived. For we know one God and Him in the properties of fatherhood, and sonship, and procession only. The difference we conceive of according to cause and effect and the perfection of the Person, that is to say, His manner of existing.¹⁹ For

19 Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *That There Are Not Three Gods* (PG 45-133BC).

with the uncircumscribed Godhead we cannot speak of any difference in place, as we do with ourselves, because the Persons exist in one another, not so as to be confused, but so as to adhere closely together as expressed in the words of the Lord when He said: 'I in the Father and the Father in me.'²⁰ Neither can we speak of a difference in will, or judgment, or operation, or virtue, or any other whatsoever of those things which in us give rise to a definite real distinction. For that reason, we do not call the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost three Gods, but one God, the Holy Trinity, in whom the Son and the Holy Ghost are related to one Cause without any composition or blending such as is the coalescence of Sabellius. For they are united, as we said, so as not to be confused, but to adhere closely together, and they have their circumincession one in the other without any blending or mingling and without change or division in substance such as is the division held by Arius.²¹ Thus, must one put it concisely, the Godhead is undivided in things divided, just as in three suns joined together without any intervening interval there is one blending and the union of the light.²² So, when we contemplate the Godhead, and the First Cause, and the Monarchy, and the unity and identity, so to speak, of the motion and will of the Godhead, and the identity of substance, virtue, operation, and dominion, then that which appears to us is One. But, when we contemplate the things in which the Godhead exists, or, to put it more accurately, those things which are the Godhead and which come from the First Cause independently of time, with equal glory, and inseparably—that is, the Persons of the Son and the Spirit—then we adore Three. One Father, the Father without beginning, that is to say, uncaused, for He is from no one. One Son,

²⁰ John 14.11.

²¹ Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 20.6 (PG 35.1072B); Pseudo-Dionysius, *Divine Names* 2.4 (PG 3.641AB).

²² Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 31.14 (PG 36.149A).

the Son who is not without beginning, that is to say, not uncaused, for He is from the Father; but, should you take the beginning as being in time, then He is without beginning, because He is the maker of the ages and not subject to time. One Spirit, the Holy Ghost coming forth from the Father, not by filiation but by procession. And, as the Father does not cease to be unbegotten because He has begotten, nor the Son cease to be begotten because He is begotten of the Unbegotten—for how could He?—so neither does the Spirit change into the Father or the Son, because He proceeds and is God. The property is unchangeable, since how would it otherwise remain a property should it be changed and transformed? Thus, if the Son is the Father, then He is not properly the Father, because there is only one who is properly the Father; and, if the Father is the Son, He is not properly the Son, because there is only one who is properly the Son, and only one who is properly the Holy Ghost.

One should know that we do not say that the Father is of anyone, but that we do say that He is the Father of the Son. We do not say that the Son is a cause or a father, but we do say that He is from the Father and is the Son of the Father. And we do say that the Holy Ghost is of the Father and we call Him the Spirit of the Father. Neither do we say that the Spirit is from the Son, but we call Him the Spirit of the Son—‘Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ,’ says the divine Apostle, ‘he is none of his.’²³ We also confess that He was manifested and communicated to us through the Son, for ‘He breathed,’ it says, ‘and he said to his disciples: Receive ye the Holy Ghost.’²⁴ It is just like the rays and brightness coming from the sun, for the sun is the source of its rays and brightness and the brightness is communicated to us through the rays, and that it is which lights us and is enjoyed by us. Neither do we say that the Son is of the Spirit, nor, most certainly, from the Spirit.

²³ Rom. 8.9.

²⁴ John. 20.22.

Chapter 9

The Divinity is simple and uncompounded. But, that which is composed of several different things is compounded. Consequently, should we say that the increate, unoriginate, incorporeal, immortal, eternal, good, creative, and the like are essential differences in God, then, since He is composed of so many things, He will not be simple but compounded, which is impious to the last degree. Therefore, one should not suppose that any one of these things which are affirmed of God is indicative of what He is in essence. Rather, they show either what He is not, or some relation to some one of those things that are contrasted with Him, or something of those things which are consequential to His nature or operation.

Now, it seems that of all the names given to God the more proper is that of **HE WHO IS**, as when in conversing with Moses on the mountain He says: 'Say to the children of Israel: **HE WHO IS** hath sent me.'¹ For, like some limitless and boundless sea of essence, He contains all being in Himself.² But then, as St. Dionysius says, He is 'The Good,' for in God one may not say that the being comes first and then the good afterwards.³

A second name is **ΘΕΟΣ** which derives from **θέειν**, to run, because of His running through all things and having care for them. Or it is from **αἶθω**, that is, to burn, because God is a fire consuming all evil.⁴ Or it is from His **θεᾶσθαι**,⁵ or seeing all things, because nothing escapes Him and He watches over all, and because He saw all things before they came to pass.⁶ For He conceived of them independently

1 Exod. 3.14.

2 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 38.7 (PG 36.317B).

3 Pseudo-Dionysius, *Divine Names* 2.1 (PG 3.636-637).

4 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 30.18 (PG 36.128A); Deut. 4.24.

5 Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *In Cant. Hom.* 5 (PG 44.861B), and *That There Are Not Three Gods* (PG 45.121D).

6 Cf. 2 Mach. 9.5; Dan. 13.42.

of time and each one comes to pass at the foreordained time in accordance with the predetermination and image and exemplar contained in His timeless will and design.

The former name, then, is expressive of His existence and His essence, while the latter is expressive of His operation. But the names 'Without beginning,' 'Incorruptible,' 'Unoriginate' or 'Uncreated,' 'Incorporeal,' 'Invisible,' and the like all show that He had no beginning of being, that He is not corruptible, is not created, is not a body, and is not visible. The names 'Good,' 'Just,' 'Holy,' and the like are consequential to His nature and are not indicative of the essence itself. Those of 'Lord,' 'King,' and the like are indicative of a relation to things that are contrasted with Him. Thus, of those that are lorded over He is called Lord, of those that are ruled over He is called King, of those that are created He is called Creator, and of those that are shepherded He is called Shepherd.

Chapter 10

All the aforesaid names are to be taken as applying in common, in the same manner, simply, indivisibly, and unitedly to the whole Godhead.¹ But the names 'Father' and 'Son' and 'Spirit,' 'Uncaused' and 'Caused,' 'Unbegotten' and 'Begotten' and 'Proceeding' are to be taken as applying in a different way, because they declare not the essence, but the mutual relationship and manner of existence [of the Persons].

Even when we have perceived these things and have been guided by them to the Divine Essence, we still do not grasp the essence itself, but only things relating to it. Just as, although we may know that the soul is without body, without quantity, and without shape, even then we have not grasped its essence. And in the same way, if we happen

¹ Cf. Pseudo-Dionysius, *Divine Names* 2.3 (PG 3.640B).

to know that the body is white or black, we have not comprehended the essence of the body, but only something related to it. True reason teaches us that the Divinity is simple and has one simple operation which is good and which effects all things, like the rays of the sun which warm all things and exercise their force in each in accordance with the natural capacity of each, having received such power of operation from God who created them.

On the other hand, everything that pertains to the divine and benevolent incarnation of the Word of God has a distinct application. For, in these, neither the being Father nor the being Spirit is in any way communicated save by good pleasure and the ineffable wondrous operation which God the Word worked, when, while being God unchangeable and the Son of God, He became a man like us.²

Chapter 11

Since in sacred Scripture we find many things said symbolically of God as if He had a body, one should know that since we are men clothed in this gross flesh, we are unable to think or speak of the divine, lofty, and immaterial operations of the Godhead unless we have recourse to images, types, and symbols that correspond to our own nature.¹ Consequently, everything that is said of God as if He had a body is said symbolically and has a loftier meaning. Thus, by the eyes and eyelids and sight of God let us understand His power of penetrating all things and His unescapable knowledge, by analogy with our own acquisition of more complete knowledge and certainty through this particular sense. By His ears and hearing let us understand His gracious acceptance of our supplications, for by this sense we, too,

2 Cf. *ibid.* 2.6 (PG 3.644C); Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 34.10 (PG-36.252A).

1 Cf. Pseudo-Dionysius, *op. cit.* 1.8 (PG 3.597AB).

become well disposed toward them that petition us and more favorably incline our ear to them. By His mouth and speech let us understand the expression of His will, by analogy with our own expression of our innermost thoughts by mouth and speech. By His food and drink let us understand our concurrence with His will, for by the sense of taste we, too, satisfy the necessary appetite of our nature. By His smelling let us understand His acceptance of our good will toward Him and our thoughts, by analogy with our own perception of fragrance through this sense. By His face let us understand His being declared and revealed through His works, inasmuch as we ourselves are discovered by our faces. By His hands let us understand the prosecution of His operation, for it is by means of our hands that we successfully perform necessary and most worthy works. By His right hand let us understand His aid in advantageous things, by analogy with our own use of our right hand in the performance of the more noble and worthy actions and those which require our full strength. By His touching let us understand His most accurate discernment and exaction of exceedingly minute and hidden things, because those whom we feel all over are unable to conceal anything upon their persons. By His feet and walking let us understand His coming to the aid of the needy, or to work vengeance on enemies, or to do some other thing, by analogy with our accomplishing our own coming through the use of our feet. By His swearing let us understand the immutability of His will, because it is by oaths that we make conventions with one another. By His wrath and indignation let us understand His aversion to evil and His hatred of it, for we, too, hate things which are against our wishes and we are angry at them.¹ By His forgetfulness and His sleep and His drowsiness let us understand His putting off vengeance on His enemies and His delaying aid for His own. Thus, to put it simply, all these things which are affirmed of God as if He had a body con-

1 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 31.22 (PG 36.157B).

tain some hidden meaning which, through things corresponding to our nature, teaches us things which exceed our nature—except it be something said respecting the presence of the Word of God in the flesh. For, for our salvation He took on the whole man, both the intellectual soul and the body, and the peculiar properties of human nature as well as the natural but not blameworthy passions.

Chapter 12

In these things, then, have we been instructed by the sacred sayings, as the divine Dionysius the Areopagite has said,¹ namely, that God is the Cause and Principle of all things, the Essence of things that are, the Life or the living, the Reason of the rational, the Understanding of them that have understanding, the Revival and the raising up of them that fall away from Him, the Remaking and Reforming of them that are by nature corruptible, the holy Support of them that are tossed on an unholy sea, the sure Support of them that stand, and the Way and the outstretched guiding Hand to them that are drawn to Him. Moreover, I shall add that He is the Father of them that have been made by Him. For our God, who has brought us from nothing into being, is more properly our Father than they who have begotten us, but who have received from Him both their being and their power to beget. He is the Shepherd of them that follow after Him and are led by Him. He is the Illumination of the enlightened. He is the Initiation of the initiate. He is the Godliness of the godly. He is the Reconciliation of them that are at variance. He is the Simplicity of them that are become simple. He is the Unity of them that seek unity. As Principle of Principles He is the transcendent Principle of every principle. He is the good Communication of His hidden things, that is, of His knowledge, in so far as is allowable and meets with the capacity of each individual.

¹ Pseudo-Dionysius, *op. cit.* 1.1 (PG 3.585B).

*[More on the Names of God and More Precisely]*²

Since the Divinity is incomprehensible, He must remain absolutely nameless. Accordingly, since we do not know His essence, let us not look for a name for His essence, for names are indicative of what things are. However, although God is good and has brought us from nothing into being to share His goodness and has given us knowledge, yet, since He did not communicate His essence to us, so neither did He communicate the knowledge of His essence. It is impossible for a nature to know a nature of a higher order perfectly; but, if knowledge is of things that are, then how will that which is superessential be known? So, in His ineffable goodness He sees fit to be named from things which are on the level of our nature, that we may not be entirely bereft of knowledge of Him but may have at least some dim understanding. Therefore, in so far as He is incomprehensible, He is also unnameable. But, since He is the cause of all things and possesses beforehand in Himself the reasons and causes of all, so He can be named after all things—even after things which are opposites, such as light and darkness, water and fire—so that we may know that He is not these things in essence, but is superessential and unnameable. Thus, since He is the cause of all beings, He is named after all things that are caused.

Wherefore, some of the divine names are said by negation and show His superessentiality, as when He is called 'Insubstantial,' 'Timeless,' 'Without beginning,' 'Invisible'—not because He is inferior to anything or lacking in anything, for all things are His and from Him and by Him were made and in Him consist,³ but because He is pre-eminently set apart from all beings. The names that are given by negation are predicated of Him as being the cause of all things. For, in so far as He is the cause of all beings and of every essence,

² This additional chapter is found only in some of the later codices, but the Byzantines have always considered it to be genuine.

³ Col. 1.17.

He is called 'Being' and 'Essence.' As the cause of all reason and wisdom, and as that of the reasoning and the wise, He is called 'Wisdom' and 'Wise.' In the same way, He is called 'Mind' and 'Understanding,' 'Life' and 'Living,' 'Might' and 'Mighty,' and so on with all the rest. But especially may He be named after those more noble things which approach Him more closely. Immaterial things are more noble than material, the pure more so than the sordid, the sacred more so than the profane, and they approach Him more closely because they participate in Him more. Consequently, He may be called sun and light much more suitably than darkness, day more suitably than night, life more suitably than death, and fire, air, and water (since these are life-giving) more suitably than earth. And, above all, He may be called goodness rather than evil, which is the same thing as to say being rather than non-being, because good is existence and the cause of existence. These are all negations and affirmations, but the most satisfactory is the combination of both, as, for example, the 'superessential Essence,' the 'superdivine Godhead,' the 'Principle beyond all principles,' and so on. There are also some things which are affirmed of God positively, but which have the force of extreme negation, as, for example, darkness—not because God is darkness, but because He is light and more than light.

And so, God is called 'Mind,' and 'Reason,' and Spirit,' and 'Wisdom,' because He is the cause of these, and because He is immaterial, and because He is all-working and all-powerful.⁴ And these names, both those given by negation and those given by affirmation, are applied jointly to the whole Godhead. They also apply in the same way, identically, and without exception, to each one of the Persons of the Holy Trinity. Thus, when I think of one of the Persons, I know that He is perfect God, a perfect substance, but

4 Cf. Pseudo-Dionysius, *op. cit.* 7 (PG 3.865ff.).

when I put them together and combine them, I know one perfect God. For the Godhead is not compounded, but is one perfect, indivisible, and uncompounded being in three perfect beings. However, whenever I think of the negation of the Persons to one another, I know that the Father is a supersubstantial sun, a well-spring of goodness, an abyss of essence, reason, wisdom, power, light, and divinity, a begetting and emitting well-spring of the good hidden in Himself. Thus, He is 'Mind,' 'Abyss of reason,' 'Begetter of the Word,' and, through the Word, 'Emitter' of the revealing Spirit. And, not to speak at too great length, the Father has no reason, wisdom, power, or will other than the Son, who is the only power of the Father and the primordial force of the creation of all things. As a perfect hypostasis begotten of a perfect hypostasis, in a manner which He alone knows, is He who is the Son and is so called. Then there is the Holy Ghost, a power of the Father revealing the hidden things of the Godhead and proceeding from the Father through the Son, not by begetting, but in a manner which He alone knows. Wherefore the Holy Ghost is also perfecter of the creation of all things. Consequently, whatsoever pertains to the Father as cause, well-spring, and begetter must be attributed to the Father alone. Whatsoever pertains to the Son as caused, begotten son, word, primordial force, will, and wisdom must be attributed to the Son alone. And whatsoever pertains to the caused, proceeding, revealing, and perfecting power must be attributed to the Holy Ghost. The Father is well-spring and cause of Son and Holy Ghost—He is Father of the only Son and Emitter of the Holy Ghost. The Son is son, word, wisdom, power, image, radiance, and type of the Father, and He is from the Father. And the Holy Ghost is not a son of the Father, but He is the Spirit of the Father as proceeding from the Father. For, without the Spirit, there is no impulsions. And He is the Spirit of the Son, not as being from Him, but as proceeding through Him from the Father—for the Father alone is Cause.

Chapter 13

Place is physical, being the limits of the thing containing within which the thing contained is contained. The air, for example, contains and the body is contained, but not all of the containing air is the place of the contained body, but only those limits of the containing air which are adjacent to the contained body. And this is necessarily so, because the thing containing is not in the thing contained.

However, there is also an intellectual place where the intellectual and incorporeal nature is thought of as being and where it actually is. There it is present and acts; and it is not physically contained, but spiritually, because it has no form to permit it to be physically contained. Now, God, being immaterial and uncircumscribed, is not in a place. For He, who fills all things and is over all things and Himself encompasses all things, is His own place.¹ However, God is also said to be in a place; and this place where God is said to be is there where His operation is plainly visible. Now, He does pervade all things without becoming mixed with them, and to all things He communicates His operation in accordance with the fitness and receptivity of each—in accordance with their purity of nature and will, I mean to say. For the immaterial things are purer than the material and the virtuous more pure than such as are partisan to evil. Thus, the place where God is said to be is that which experiences His operation and grace to a greater extent. For this reason, heaven is His Throne,² because it is in heaven that the angels are who do His will and glorify Him unceasingly. For heaven is His resting place and the earth his footstool, because on the earth He conversed in the flesh with men.³ And the sacred flesh of God has been called His foot. The Church, too, is called the place of God, because we have set it apart

¹ Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 28.8-10 (PG 36.33-40).

² Cf. Isa. 66.1.

³ *Ibid.*; Baruch 3.38.

for His glorification as a sort of hallowed spot in which we also make our intercessions to Him. In the same way, those places in which His operation is plainly visible to us, whether it is realized in the flesh or out of the flesh, are called places of God.

Moreover, one must know that the Divinity is without parts and that He is wholly everywhere in His entirety, not being physically distributed part for part, but wholly in all things and wholly over the universe.

*[On the Place of an Angel and of the Soul, and on the Uncircumscribed]*⁴

Although the angel is not contained physically in a place so as to assume form and shape, he is said to be in a place because of his being spiritually present there and acting according to his nature, and because of his being nowhere else but remaining spiritually circumscribed there where he acts. For he cannot act in different places at the same time, because only God can act everywhere at the same time. For the angel acts in different places by virtue of a natural swiftness and his ability to pass without delay, that is, swiftly, from place to place; but the Divinity being everywhere and beyond all at the same time acts in different places by one simple operation.

The soul is united with the body, the entire soul with the entire body and not part for part. And it is not contained by the body, but rather contains it, just as heat does iron, and, although it is in the body, carries on its own proper activities.

Now, to be circumscribed means to be determined by place, time, or comprehension, while to be contained by none of these is to be uncircumscribed. So the Divinity alone is uncircumscribed, who is without beginning and without end, who embraces all things and is grasped by no comprehension

⁴ This is a marginal addition to the manuscript.

at all. For He alone is incomprehensible, undefinable, and known by no one; and He alone has a clear vision of Himself. The angel, however, is circumscribed by time, because he had a beginning of being; and by place, even though it be spiritually, as we have said before; and by comprehension, because their natures are to some extent known to each other and because they are completely defined by the Creator. Bodies also are circumscribed by beginning, end, physical place, and comprehension.

*[A Miscellany on God, and the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and on the Word and the Spirit]*⁵

The Divinity, therefore, is absolutely unchangeable and inalterable. For, all things which are not in our power He predetermined by His foreknowledge, each one in its own proper time and place. It is in this sense that it is said: 'Neither does the Father judge any man: but hath given all judgment to the Son.'⁶ For, of course, the Father has judged, and so has the Son of God, and so has the Holy Ghost. But, as man, the Son Himself will come down in His body and sit upon the throne of glory—for both the coming down and the sitting will be of His circumscribed body—and He will judge the whole world in equity.'⁷

All things are far from God: not in place, but in nature. With us, prudence and wisdom and counsel come and go like habits, but that is certainly not the case with God. With Him, nothing comes into being or ceases to be, and one must not speak of accidents, because He is inalterable and unchangeable. The good is concomitant to His essence. He sees God who always longs for Him, for all things that are are dependent upon Him who is, so that it is impossible for anything to be, unless it have its being in Him who is. Indeed,

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ John 5.22.

⁷ Acts 17.31.

in so far as He sustains their nature, God is mixed in with all things. God the Word, however, was united to His sacred body hypostatically and was combined with our nature without being mingled with it.

No one sees the Father, except the Son and the Spirit.⁸

The Son is the counsel, the wisdom, and the power of the Father. For we must not speak of quality in God, lest we say that He is composed of substance and quality.

The Son is from the Father, and whatsoever He has He has from Him. For that reason, He can do nothing of Himself.⁹ Thus, He has no operation that it is distinct from the Father.¹⁰

That God, although invisible by nature, becomes visible through His operations we know from the arrangement of the world and from its governing.¹¹

The Son is image of the Father, and image of the Son is the Spirit, through whom the Christ dwelling in man gives it to him to be to the image of God.

The Holy Ghost is God. He is the median of the Unbegotten and the Begotten and He is joined with the Father through the Son. He is called Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ, Mind of Christ, Spirit of the Lord, True Lord, Spirit of adoption, freedom, and wisdom—for He is the cause of all these.¹² He fills all things with His essence and sustains all things. In His essence He fills the world, but in His power the world does not contain Him.

God is substance eternal, unchangeable, creative of the things that are, and to be adored with devout consideration.

The Father is also God. It is He who is ever-unbegotten, because He was never begotten of anyone, but He has begotten a co-eternal Son. The Son is also God. It is He who is

8 Cf. John 6.46.

9 Cf. John 5.30.

10 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 30.11 (PG 36.116C).

11 Cf. Rom. 1.20.

12 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 31.29 (PG 36.165BC).

ever with the Father, having been begotten of Him timelessly, eternally, without change, without passion, and without cease. The Holy Ghost is also God. He is a sanctifying force that is subsistent, that proceeds unceasingly from the Father and abides in the Son, and that is of the same substance as the Father and the Son.

The Word is He who is ever present with the Father substantially. In another sense, a word is the natural movement of the mind, by which the mind moves and thinks and reasons, as if it were the light and radiance of the mind. And again, a word is that internal thought which is spoken in the heart. Still again, there is the spoken word which is a messenger of the mind. Now, God the Word is both substantial and subsistent, while the other three kinds of word are faculties of the soul and are not found to exist in their own hypostases. The first of these is a product of the mind, ever springing naturally from the mind. The second is called internal, and the third called spoken.

The term 'spirit' is understood in several ways. There is the Holy Spirit. And the powers of this Holy Spirit are also called spirits. The good angel is likewise a spirit, and so is the demon and the soul. There are times when even the mind is called spirit. The wind is also a spirit, and so is the air.

Chapter 14

The uncreate, the unoriginate, the immortal, the boundless, the eternal, the immaterial, the good, the creative, the just, the enlightening, the unchangeable, the passionless, the uncircumscribed, the uncontained, the unlimited, the indefinable, the invisible, the inconceivable, the wanting nothing, the having absolute power and authority, the life-giving, the almighty, the infinitely powerful, the sanctifying and communicating, the containing and sustaining all things, and the providing for all—all these and the like He possesses by His nature. They are not received from any other source;

on the contrary, it is His nature that communicates all good to His own creatures in accordance with the capacity of each.

The abiding and resting of the Persons in one another is not in such a manner that they coalesce or become confused, but, rather, so that they adhere to one another, for they are without interval between them and inseparable and their mutual indwelling is without confusion. For the Son is in the Father and the Spirit, and the Spirit is in the Father and the Son, and the Father is in the Son and the Spirit, and there is no merging or blending or confusion. And there is one surge and one movement of the three Persons. It is impossible for this to be found in any created nature.

Then there is the fact that the divine irradiation and operation is one, simple, and undivided; and that, while it is apparently diversely manifested in divisible things, dispensing to all of them the components of their proper nature, it remains simple. Indivisibly, it is multiplied in divisible things, and, gathering them together, it reverts them to its own simplicity.¹ For, toward Him all things tend, and in Him they have their existence, and to all things He communicates their being in accordance with the nature of each. He is the being of things that are, the life of the living, the reason of the rational, and the intelligence of intelligent beings. He surpasses intelligence, reason, life, and essence.

And then again, there is His pervading of all things without Himself being contaminated, whereas nothing pervades Him. And yet again, there is His knowing of all things by a simple act of knowing. And there is His distinctly seeing with His divine, all-seeing, and immaterial eye all things at once, both present and past and future, before they come to pass.² And there is His sinlessness, His forgiving of sins and saving. And, finally, there is the fact that all that He wills He can do, even though He does not will all the things that He can do—for He can destroy the world, but He does not will to do so.

1 Cf. Pseudo-Dionysius, *Divine Names* 2 (PG 3.636ff.).

2 Cf. Dan. 13.42.

BOOK TWO

Chapter 1

HE MADE THE AGES who exists before the ages, of whom the divine David says: 'From eternity and to eternity thou art';¹ and the divine Apostle: 'By whom also he made the ages.'²

Now, one should note that the term *age* has several meanings, because it signifies a great many things. Thus, the span of life of every man is called an age. Again, a period of one thousand years is called an age. Still again, this whole present life is called an age, and so is the age without end to come after the resurrection.³ And again, that is called an age which is neither time nor any division of time measured by the course and motion of the sun—that is to say, made up of days and nights—but which is co-extensive with eternal things after the fashion of some sort of temporal period and interval. This kind of age is to eternal things exactly what time is to temporal things.⁴

¹ Ps. 89.2.

² Heb. 1.2.

³ Cf. Matt. 12.32.

⁴ The *aevum* of the Scholastics. Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 29.3 (PG 36.77AB).

Now, this world is said to have seven ages, that is to say, from the creation of heaven and earth until the general consummation and resurrection of men. For, while there is a particular consummation, which is the death of each individual, there is also a general and final consummation which will come when the general resurrection of men takes place. The eighth age is that which is to come.

Before the framing of the world, when there was no sun to separate day from night, there was no measurable age, but only an age co-extensive with eternal things after the fashion of some sort of temporal period and interval. In this sense, there is one age in respect to which God is said to be of the ages, and, indeed, before the ages, for He made the very ages—since He alone is God without beginning and Himself creator both of the ages and of the things that are. When I speak of God, however, it is obvious that I mean the Father and His only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, and His All-Holy Spirit—our one God.

We also speak of the ages of ages, inasmuch as the seven ages of the present world contain many ages, that is to say, generations of men, whereas there is one age containing all ages and which is called the age of ages—both present and future. Furthermore, the expressions 'age-enduring life' and 'age-enduring chastisement' show the eternity of the age to come. For, after the resurrection, time will not be numbered by days and nights at all; rather, there will be one day without evening, with the Sun of Justice shining brightly upon the just and a deep and endless night reserved for the sinners. How, then, will the time of Origen's millenium be measured? God, therefore, is the one maker of the ages—He who also created all things and who exists before the ages.

Chapter 2

Now, because the good and transcendently good God was not content to contemplate Himself, but by a superabundance of goodness saw fit that there should be some things to benefit by and participate in His goodness, He brings all things from nothing into being and creates them, both visible and invisible, and man, who is made up of both. By thinking He creates, and, with the Word fulfilling and the Spirit perfecting, the object of His thought subsists.¹

Chapter 3

He is the maker and creator of the *angels*. He brought them from nothing into being and made them after His own image into a bodiless nature, some sort of spirit, as it were, and immaterial fire—as the divine David says: ‘Who maketh his angels spirits: and his ministers a burning fire.’¹ And He determined their lightness, fieriness, heat, extreme acuity, their keenness in their desire for God and His service, and their being raised up and removed from every material consideration.

So, an angel is an intellectual substance, ever in motion, free, incorporeal, ministering to God, with the gift of immortality in its nature. And the form and the definition of this substance only the Creator understands. Now, compared with us, the angel is said to be incorporeal and immaterial, although in comparison with God, who alone is incomparable, everything proves to be gross and material—for only the Divinity is truly immaterial and incorporeal.

So, the angel is of a nature which is rational, intelligent, free, and variable in judgment, that is, subject to voluntary

¹ Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 38.9 (PG 36.320).

¹ Ps. 103.4.

change. It is only the Uncreated which is unchangeable. Also, every rational being is free. The angelic nature, then, in so far as it is rational and intelligent, is free; while, in so far as it is created, it is changeable and has the power to persevere and progress in good or to turn to evil.

Although man, by reason of the infirmity of his body, is capable of repentance, the angel, because of his incorporeality, is not.

The angel is immortal, not by nature, but by grace; for, naturally, everything that has beginning has an end, too. Only God is always existing—rather, transcends always, because He who made the times is not subject to time but transcends it.

The angels are secondary spiritual lights, who receive their brightness from that first Light which is without beginning. They have no need of tongue and hearing; rather, they communicate their individual thoughts and designs to one another without having recourse to the spoken word.

Now, all the angels were created by the Word and perfected by the sanctification of the Holy Ghost, and in accordance with their dignity and rank they enjoy brightness and grace.²

The angels are circumscribed, because when they are in heaven they are not on earth, and when they are sent to earth by God they do not remain in heaven. However, they are not confined by walls or doors or bars or seals, because they are unbounded. I say that they are unbounded, because they do not appear exactly as they are to the just and to them that God wills them to appear to. On the contrary, they appear under such a different form as can be seen by those who behold them. Of course, only the Uncreated is by nature unbounded, for all creation is bounded by God who created it.

The angels do not receive their sanctification by the Spirit as something due their essence. It is by the grace of God that they prophesy. They have no need of marriage, precisely because they are not mortal.

² Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *loc. cit.*

Since they are intellects, they are in places intellectually and are not corporeally circumscribed. For by nature they do not have bodily shape and they are not extended in three dimensions; rather, they are present and act in space intellectually in whatsoever place they are commanded to do so, and they are not able to be present and act in different places at the same time.

Whether the angels are equal in essence or whether they differ from one another we do not know. Only God knows, who made them and knows all things. They do, however, differ from one another in brightness and station, either having their station in accordance with their brightness or enjoying their brightness in accordance with their station. They illuminate one another by the excellence of their rank or nature. Moreover, it is evident that the more excellent communicate their brightness and their knowledge to them that are inferior.³

They are vigorous and prompt in the execution of the divine will and by a natural quickness they appear immediately in whatever place the divine pleasure may command. They watch over the parts of the earth and are set over nations and places in accordance with their disposition by the Creator. They direct our affairs and help us. Moreover, they are ever round about God for the very reason that in accordance with the divine will and command they are above us.⁴

They are with difficulty moved towards evil, but they can be so moved.⁵ However, they cannot be moved toward evil—not because of their nature, but by grace and their diligent pursuit of the only Good.

They see God to such an extent as is possible for them, and this is their food.⁶

Although, because they are incorporeal, they are superior

³ Cf. Pseudo-Dionysius, *Celestial Hierarchy* 3 (PG 3.164ff.).

⁴ Cf. *ibid.* 9 (PG 3.257ff.).

⁵ Gregory Nazianzen, *op. cit.* (PG 36.321A).

⁶ Cf. Tobias 12.19 (Vulgate).

to us and free of all bodily passion, they are certainly not passionless, because only the Divinity is passionless.

They take whatever form the Lord may command, and thus they appear to men and reveal the divine mysteries to them.

They live in heaven and have as their one work to sing the praises of God and minister to His sacred will.

As the most holy and sacred Dionysius the Areopagite, who is very well versed in theology, says,⁷ all theology, that is to say, sacred Scripture, has given the heavenly substances as nine in number. The divine initiator divides these into three orders of three. He says that the first of these is ever round about God and that to it has it been given to be united directly and immediately to Him. This is the order of the six-winged Seraphim and the many-eyed Cherubim and the most holy Thrones. The second order is that of the Dominations and the Virtues and the Powers. The third is that of the Principalities and the Archangels and the Angels.

Now, some say that the angels were made before all creation, as Gregory the Theologian says: 'First He conceived the angelic and heavenly powers, and His conception was an accomplished work.'⁸ But there are others who say that they were made after the creation of the first heaven. However, they all agree that it was before the formation of man. For my part, I agree with the Theologian, because it was fitting for the spiritual substance to be created first and then the sensible and then finally man himself from both.

Moreover, if there is anyone who says that there is any kind of substance whatsoever that the angels can create, he is the mouthpiece of his father, the Devil. For, since they are creatures, they are not creators. He who made all things, provides for all, and sustains them is God, who alone is uncreated, who is praised and glorified in the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost.

⁷ Pseudo-Dionysius, *op. cit.* 6.2 (PG 3.200D-201A).

⁸ Gregory Nazianzen, *op. cit.* (PG 36.320C).

Chapter 4

One of these angelic powers was chief of the terrestrial order and had been entrusted by God with the custody of the earth. Although he was not evil by nature, but good, and although he had been made for good and had in himself not the slightest trace of evil from the Creator, he did not keep the brightness and dignity which the Creator had bestowed upon him. By his free choice he turned from what was according to nature to what was against it. Having become stirred up against the God who created him and having willed to rebel against Him, he was the first to abandon good and become evil. For evil is no more than the privation of good, just as darkness is the absence of light. And good is spiritual light, while in the same way evil is spiritual darkness. Now, light was made by the Creator and it was good, for 'God saw all the things which he had made, and they were very good,'¹ but darkness came by free will. And together with him a numberless horde of the angels that he had marshaled were torn away, and followed after him and fell. Hence, although they were of the same nature as the angels, they have become bad by freely turning from good to evil.²

They have no power or strength against anyone, unless this be permitted them by the dispensation of God, as in the case of Job and as has been written in the Gospel about the swine.³ If God does give them permission, they have strength and change and transform themselves into whatever apparent form they may desire.

Neither the angels of God nor the evil spirits know the future. Nevertheless, they foretell it. The angels do so when God reveals the future to them and orders them to foretell it, for which reason whatever they say happens. On the

¹ Gen. 1.31.

² Cf. *Questions to Antiochus* 7 (PG 28.604A).

³ Cf. Job. 1.12, 2.6; Mark 5.13.

other hand, the evil spirits foretell the future, sometimes by seeing the things that are to happen far ahead, and sometimes by guessing at them. For this reason one must not believe them, even though they may often speak the truth by the manner of which we have spoken. Moreover, they also know the Scriptures.

And so, all evil and the impure passions have been conceived by them and they have been permitted to visit attacks upon man. But they are unable to force anyone, for it is in our power either to accept the visitation or not. Wherefore, the unquenchable fire and everlasting torment have been prepared for the Devil and his evil spirits and for them who follow him.⁴

One should note that the fall is to the angels just what death is to men. For, just as there is no repentance for men after their death, so is there none for the angels after their fall.⁵

Chapter 5

Our God, who is glorified in trinity and unity, Himself 'made heaven and earth, and all things that are in them.'¹ He brought all things from nothing into being: some, such as heaven, earth, air, fire, and water, from no pre-existing matter; and others, such as animals, plants and seeds, He made from those things which had their existence directly from Him. For, by the command of the Creator these last were made from earth, water, air, and fire.

Chapter 6

The *heavens* are the outer shell which contains both visible

⁴ Cf. Matt. 25.41.

⁵ Cf. Nemesius, *On the Nature of Man* 1 (PG 40.524A).

¹ Ps. 145.6.

and invisible created things. For, enclosed and contained within them are the spiritual powers, which are the angels, and all sensible things. Only the Divinity is uncircumscribed, filling, containing, and surrounding all things, because He transcends all things and it is He who has created all.

Now, since Scripture speaks of 'heaven,' the 'heaven of heaven,' and the 'heavens of heavens,' and says that the blessed Paul was caught up to the '*third heaven*,'² we say that in the creation of the universe we consider as heavens that which the pagan philosophers, making the teachings of Moses their own, call a starless sphere. And again, God called heaven the 'firmament,'³ which He ordered to be made in the midst of the water and so arranged that it was separated from the midst of the water above the firmament and from the midst of that which is below the firmament. Instructed by sacred Scripture, the divine Basil says⁴ that its substance is subtile—like smoke, as it were. Others say that it is watery, because it was made in the midst of the waters. And others say that it is made from the four elements. Still others say that it is a fifth body and distinct from the four elements.⁵

Furthermore, some have surmised that the heavens surround the universe and have the form of a sphere which is everywhere the highest point, while the center of the space enclosed by it is the lowest point; and that the airier and lighter bodies have been assigned by the Creator to the higher positions, while the heavy and unbuoyant have been consigned to the lower, which is the center. Now, the lightest and the most buoyant of the elements is fire, so they say that it comes directly below the heavens. They call it ether. Just below the ether comes the air. Earth and water, since they are heavier and less buoyant, are said to be hung in the midmost position, so that by contrast they are below. The water, however, is lighter than the earth—whence its greater mobility. Everywhere above this, like a blanket, lies

2 Ps. 113.16, 148.4; 2 Cor. 12.2.

3 Gen. 1.8.

4 Cf. Isa. 40.22; Basil *Homily 1 on the Six Days* 8, (PG 29.20C-21A).

5 Cf. Basil, *op. cit.* 11 (PG 29.25B).

the encircling air; everywhere around the air is the ether; and on the outside encircling them all are the heavens.

Furthermore, they say that the heavens revolve and that they so bind together the things contained within that they stay firmly together and do not fall apart.

They say that the heavens have seven spheres, one above the other.⁶ They further say that the substance of the heavens is very subtile, like smoke, and that in each one of the spheres is one of the planets. For they have said that there are seven planets: the Sun, the Moon, Jupiter, Mercury, Mars, Venus, and Saturn. Venus, they say, is sometimes the morning star and sometimes the evening star. They called them planets, or wanderers, because their motion is contrariwise to that of the heavens. For, while the heavens and the rest of the stars move from east to west, these alone have their motion from west to east. This we may know from the example of the moon, which moves back a little every evening.

Now, those who held that the heavens were spherical say that they are removed from the earth by an equal distance above, on the sides, and below. By 'below' and 'on the sides' I mean in so far as is apparent to our senses, because it logically follows that the heavens occupy the highest position at all points and the earth the lowest. They also say that the heavens surround the earth like a sphere and by their very rapid movement carry the sun, moon, and stars around with them. And they say that, when the sun is over the earth, then it is day here, while when it is under the earth, it is night; but when the sun goes down under the earth, then it is night here and day there.

Others, however, have imagined the heavens to have the form of a hemisphere, because the inspired David says: 'Who stretchest out the heaven like a pavilion,' which means a tent; and the blessed Isaias: 'He that establisheth the

⁶ Cf. Basil, *Homily 3 on the Six Days 3* (PG 29.57B).

heavens like a vault';⁷ and because the sun, the moon, and the stars, when they set, go round the earth from west to north and thence return again to the east. However, whichever way it may be, all things have been made and established by the command of God and have their foundation in the divine will and desire. 'For he spoke, and they were made: he commanded and they were created. He hath established them for ever, and for ages of ages: he hath made a decree and it shall not pass away.'⁸

So there⁹ is a heaven of heaven, which is the first heaven and is above the firmament. But now, because God also called the firmament 'heaven,'⁹ there are two heavens. However, it is customary for sacred Scripture to call the air heaven, too, because of its being seen above, as it says: 'O all ye fowls of the heaven, bless the Lord,'¹⁰ meaning the air, although the air is not heaven but a medium of passage for the fowls. Here we have the three heavens of which the divine Apostle spoke.¹¹ Then, if you want to take the seven spheres as seven heavens, there will still be nothing contrary to the Word of Truth. It is also customary in the Hebrew tongue to speak of heaven in the plural as 'heavens.' So, when Scripture meant to say 'heaven of heaven,' it said 'heavens of heavens,' which would mean precisely 'heaven of heaven'—that which is over the firmament and the waters which are above the heavens, whether over the air and the firmament or over the seven spheres of the firmament, or over the firmament expressed in the plural as 'heavens' according to the Hebraic usage.

Now, all things which have a beginning are subject to corruption as a logical consequence of their nature, and the heavens are no exception. It is by the grace of God that they

7 Ps. 103.2; Isa. 40.22 (Septuagint).

8 Ps. 148.5,6.

9 Gen. 1.8.

10 Dan. 3.80.

11 Cf. 2 Cor. 12.2.

are held together and sustained.¹² Only the Divinity is by nature without beginning and without end. For this reason was it said that: 'They shall perish but thou remainest.' However, the heavens will not entirely disappear: 'For they shall perish, and they shall be changed as a vesture, and there will be a new heaven and a new earth.'¹³

In size the heavens are much greater than the earth. Nevertheless, one must not inquire into the substance of the heavens, because we can know nothing about it.

Furthermore, let no one maintain that the heavens or the heavenly bodies are animate, for they are inanimate and without feeling. So, even though sacred Scripture says: 'Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad,'¹⁴ it is really calling upon the angels in heaven and the men on earth to rejoice. Of course, Scripture can personify inanimate things and talk about them as if they were alive, as for example: 'The sea saw and fled: Jordan was turned back,' and: 'What ailed thee, O thou sea, that thou didst flee? and thou, O Jordan, that thou was turned back?' and again: mountains and hills are asked the reason for their skipping.¹⁵ In just the same way it is customary for us to say that 'the city was gathered together, not intending to mean the houses, but the occupants of the houses. Still again, 'the heavens shew forth the glory of God'¹⁶ not by speaking in voice audible to sensible ears, but by manifesting to us through their own greatness the power of the Creator, and when we remark their beauty, we give glory to their Maker as the best of all artificers.¹⁷

12 Cf. Basil, *Homily 1 on the Six Days* 9 (PG 29.24B).

13 Ps. 101.27; Heb. 1.11,12; Apoc. 21.1.

14 Ps. 95.11.

15 Ps. 113.3,5,6.

16 Ps. 18.2.

17 Cf. Basil, *Homily 1 on the Six Days* 11 (PG 29.28A).

Chapter 7

Fire is one of the four elements. It is light and more buoyant than the others, and it both burns and gives light. It was made by the Creator on the first day, for sacred Scripture says: 'And God said: Be light made. And light was made.' According to what some say, fire is the same thing as *light*. Others speak of the cosmic fire above the air and they call it ether. 'In the beginning,' then, which is to say, on the first day, God made the light to adorn and enhance all visible creation. For, remove the light and everything will be in darkness and will be indistinguishable and incapable of displaying its inherent comeliness. 'And God called the light day, and the darkness night.'¹ Darkness, moreover, is not a substance, but an accident, because it is the absence of light. For light is no part of the substance of the air.² Hence, it was just the absence of light in the air that God called darkness; and darkness is not the substance of the air but the absence of light—which indicates an accident rather than a substance. Furthermore, it was not night that was called first, but day, so that day is first and night last. Accordingly, the night follows the day, and we have a period of a day and a night from the beginning of one day to that of the next—for Scripture says: 'And there was evening and morning one day.'³

And so, during those three days, day was made by the alternate diffusion and shutting out of the light at the divine command. On the fourth day God made the great luminary, the sun that is, to terminate and control the day. Thus it is that the day is determined by the sun, for, when the sun is above the earth it is day; and the duration of the day is that of the sun's course over the earth from east to west. He made a lesser luminary, too—that is, the moon—and the

¹ Gen. 1.3,1,5.

² Cf. Basil, *Homily 2 on the Six Days* 5 (PG 29.40C).

³ Gen. 1.5.

stars to determine and control the night and give it light. Now, it is night when the sun is below the earth, and the duration of the night is that of the sun's course underneath the earth from west to east. Thus, the moon and the stars have been set to light the night—but this does not mean that they are always under the earth during the daytime, for even in the daytime there are stars in the heavens over the earth. However, when the sun is shining at the same time as the stars and the moon, it dims them by its brighter radiance and keeps them from showing.

It was into these luminaries that the Creator put the primordial light, not that He was in want of any other light, but that that particular light might not remain idle. For the luminary is not the light itself, but its container.⁴

They hold the seven planets to be of the number of these luminaries and they say that their motion is opposite to that of the heavens, for which reason they have been called planets, or wanderers. For it is said that the heavens move from east to west, whereas the planets move from west to east. And the heavens bear the seven planets around with themselves by their own more rapid motion, as it were. The names of the seven planets are as follows: Moon, Mercury, Venus, Sun, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn. Furthermore, it is said that there is one planet for each of the celestial spheres:

In the first, that is to say, the highest, Saturn.

In the second, Jupiter.

In the third, Mars.

In the fourth, the Sun.

In the fifth, Venus.

In the sixth, Mercury.

In the seventh and lowest, the Moon.

They follow the unceasing course set for them by the Creator according as He founded them, as the divine David says: 'The moon and the stars which thou hast founded.'⁵

⁴ Cf. Basil, *Homily 6 on the Six Days* 2-3 (PG 29.120-121)

⁵ Ps. 8.4.

By saying 'founded' he meant the stability and immutability of the order and succession given them by God. For He arranged them 'for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years.'⁶ It is by the Sun that the four solstices are determined. The first of these is the spring solstice, for it was at the spring solstice that God made all things, which is evident from the fact that even down to the present time the budding of the flowers takes place then. It is also called an equinoctial solstice, because both the day and the night are twelve hours long. It is determined by the mean rising of the sun. The spring is mild and promotes the growth of the blood, and it is warm and wet. It stands midway between winter and summer, being warmer and drier than winter and cooler and wetter than summer. This season extends from March [21] to June 24. Then, as the sun rises farther and farther to the north, the summer solstice follows. Summer stands midway between spring and autumn. From spring it has warmth and from autumn dryness, for it is hot and dry. It also promotes the growth of the yellow bile. The summer solstice has the longest day, fifteen hours long, while its night is very short indeed, being nine hours long. Summer extends from June 24 to September 25. Then, the sun comes back again to its mean rising, summer is succeeded by autumn, which has a sort of medium coolness and warmth, dryness and wetness. It stands midway between summer and winter and has its dryness from summer and its cold from winter, for it is by its nature cold and dry. It also promotes the growth of the black bile. This solstice is also equinoctial, both its day and its night being twelve hours long. Autumn extends from September 25 to December 25. Then, as the sun's course becomes shorter and lower, that is to say, southerly, the winter solstice follows. Winter is cold and wet. It stands midway between autumn and spring and has its cold from autumn and its wetness from spring. The winter solstice has the shortest day, nine hours long, and the longest

⁶ Gen. 1.14.

night, fifteen hours long. Moreover, winter promotes the growth of the phlegm, and extends from December 25 to March 21. Thus, the Creator made wise provision against our contracting serious sicknesses from passing from the extremes of cold, heat, wetness, or dryness to the opposite extremes—for reason tells us that sudden changes are dangerous.

In this way, then, the sun produces the seasonal changes and, through them, the year. It also causes the days and nights: the former by rising and being over the earth, the latter by going down underneath the earth. By withdrawing, it causes the other luminaries to shine: the moon, that is, and the stars.

Now, they say that there are also twelve signs of the zodiac, made up of the stars in the heavens and having a motion contrary to that of the sun, the moon, and the five other planets, and that the seven pass through these twelve signs. Thus, the sun completes one month for each sign of the zodiac and in twelve months passes through the twelve signs. The following are the names of the twelve signs of the zodiac, and their months:

The sun enters *Aries* on March 21, *Taurus* on April 23, *Gemini* on May 24, *Cancer* on June 24, *Leo* on July 25, *Virgo* on August 25, *Libra* on September 25, *Scorpio* on October 25, *Sagittarius* on November 25, *Capricorn* on December 25, *Aquarius* on January 25, *Pisces* on February 24.

The moon passes through the twelve signs of the zodiac every month, because it is lower and travels through them more rapidly. For, if you put one orbit within another, the inside one will be found to be smaller. Thus, because it is lower, the course of the moon is shorter and more quickly completed.

Now, the Greeks say that all our affairs are governed by the rising, setting, and conjunction of these stars and of the sun and moon. With such things is astrology concerned. But we say that, while they do give indications of rain and

drought, cold and heat, wetness and dryness, winds, and the like, they give absolutely no indication of our actions.⁷ For we have been made free by the Creator and we control our own actions. But, if everything that we do is governed by the movement of the stars, then whatever we do we do by necessity.⁸ Now, what is done by necessity is neither virtue nor vice, and, if we have neither virtue nor vice, we deserve neither reward nor punishment. Hence, God will prove to be unjust when He gives good things to some and tribulations to others. What is more, if all things are driven and moved by necessity, then God will not be exercising either control over His creatures or providence for them. Reason also will be useless to us, for, if we have no control over any of our actions, then it is useless for us to make our own resolves. But reason has been given to us so that we may deliberate, which is why every being that is rational is also free.

We say that the stars do not cause anything to happen, whether it be the production of things that are made, or events, or the destruction of things that are destroyed. Rather, they are signs of rains and atmospheric change. One might possibly say, however, that, although they do not cause wars either, they are signs of them; and that the condition of the atmosphere, which is determined by the sun, moon and stars, in various ways favors various temperaments, habits, and dispositions. Nevertheless, habits are something under our own control, for, in so far as they are subject to the reason, they may be controlled and cultivated by it.

And there are comets, too, which oftentimes appear as portents of the death of kings. They are not of the number of the stars which have existed from the beginning, but by the divine command they take form at just the right time and then are dissolved again. And neither was the star that was seen by the Magi at the time of the Lord's gracious and saving birth according to the flesh for us one of those that

7 Cf. Basil, *op. cit.* 5 (PG 29.128-129).

8 Cf. Nemesius, *On the Nature of Man* 35 (PG 40.741).

were made at the beginning. This is also evident from the fact that they make their course now from east to west, and now from north to south, and that they now disappear and now appear. For this is not in accord with the regularity and the nature of the stars.⁹

One should note that the moon is lit by the sun. This is not because God was unable to give it its own light, but rather, that harmony and order might be imposed upon creation, with one ruling and another being ruled, and that we might be taught to have things in common with others, to share with them, and to be subject to them—first of all to the Maker and Creator, God and Lord, and then to them whom He has appointed to rule. Nor is it for me to inquire why this particular one rules; rather, I should thankfully and willingly accept all things that come from God.

The fact that the sun and moon suffer eclipse utterly refutes the folly of those who worship the creature rather than the Creator,¹⁰ and it shows that they are subject to change and variation. Now, anything that is subject to change is not God, for by its very nature it is subject to corruption and change.

The sun suffers eclipse when the mass of the moon, becoming like a sort of partition wall, casts a shadow and does not permit the light to get through to us. The extent of the eclipse, then, is proportionate to the amount of the mass of the moon concealing the sun. Now, even though the mass of the moon be smaller, do not be surprised, because, although it is maintained by some that the sun is many times larger than the earth, and by the holy Fathers that it is equal to the earth in size, it oftentimes is hidden by a small cloud, or even by a hillock or a wall.

The eclipse of the moon is brought about by the earth's shadow, when the moon is fifteen days old and directly opposite at its highest point, the sun being below the earth

⁹ Cf. Basil, *On the Nativity of Christ* (PG 31.1469-1472).

¹⁰ Cf. Rom. 1.25.

and the moon above the earth. For the earth casts a shadow and the sunlight is unable to light the moon, so that it is eclipsed.

Moreover, one should know that the Creator made the moon as full—in other words, as it is fifteen days old—for it was fitting that it should be created in its most perfect state.¹¹ However, as we said, the sun was created on the fourth day. Therefore, the moon was eleven days ahead of the sun, for from the fourth to the fifteenth there are eleven days. For this reason, the twelve lunar months have eleven days less than the twelve solar months every year. For the twelve solar months have 365 and a quarter days, whence the quarter accumulating through four years makes one full day, which is called *bissextile*—and that year has 366 days. On the other hand, the lunar years have 354 days, because from the time of its nascency, or renewal, the moon waxes until it is fourteen and three quarters days old, and then it begins to wane and wanes until it is twenty-nine and a half days old and becomes entirely dark. Then, having again made contact with the sun, it is reborn, or renewed, thus giving a reminder of our own resurrection. Consequently, the moon is eleven days behind the sun every year. Therefore, the Hebrews have an intercalary month every third year, and that year has thirteen months by reason of the accumulation of the eleven days.

Moreover, it is evident that the sun, moon, and stars are composite, and by their very nature subject to corruption. However, we do not know their nature. Thus, some say that when fire is apart from any matter it is invisible, whereas others say that when it is quenched it is changed into air.

The belt of the zodiac moves obliquely and is divided into twelve sections which are called signs of the zodiac. The sign of the zodiac has three decans, which is thirty degrees. The degree has sixty minutes. Therefore, the heavens

11 Cf. Severus Gabal., *Homily 3 on the Creation of the World* 2 (PG 56.449).

have 360 degrees, the hemisphere over the earth having 180 and that under the earth 180.

The *house* of Mars is Aries and Scorpio; that of Venus is Taurus and Libra; that of Mercury is Gemini and Virgo; that of the Moon is Cancer; that of the Sun is Leo; that of Jupiter is Sagittarius and Pisces; and that of Saturn is Capricorn and Aquarius.

Aries is the *ascension* of the Sun, Taurus that of the Moon, Cancer that of Jupiter, Virgo that of Mars, Libra that of Saturn, Capricorn that of Mercury, and Pisces that of Venus.

The moon is in *conjunction* when it is in the same degree as the sun. It is *nascent* when it is fifteen degrees distant from the sun. It is twice *rising* when it is sixty degrees distant and appears in the form of a crescent. It is twice *half full* when it is ninety degrees distant. It is twice *near full* and nearly fully lighted when it is 150 degrees distant. It is *full* when it is 180 degrees distant. It is twice *gibbous* when it is 120 degrees distant. And when we say that the moon is in a phase twice, we mean once when waxing and once when waning. It takes the moon two and one half days to pass through each sign of the zodiac.

Chapter 8

Air is a very subtle element and is both wet and warm. It is heavier than fire, but lighter than earth and water. It is the cause of breath and voice. It is colorless, that is to say it has no color by nature. It is clear and transparent, for it is receptive of light. It also serves three of our senses, since by it we see, hear, and smell. It can be heated or cooled, dried or made wet. All of its movements are local—motion upward, downward, inward, outward, to the right, to the left, and in a circle.

It does not have light from itself but gets it from the sun, the moon, the stars, and fire. This is what Scripture meant

when it said that 'darkness was upon the face of the deep,'¹ intending to show that the air does not have light from itself, but that the substance of light is something else.

Wind is a movement of the air. Or again, wind is a current of air which takes various names after the various places from which it flows.²

Air has its place, too. For the place of any body is its containing boundary. And what contains bodies, unless it be the air? There are, moreover, various places from which the movement of the air comes and after which the winds take their names. These are twelve altogether. And they say that the air is quenched fire, or that it is vapor from hot water. At any rate, air is of its own nature warm. It is, however, cooled by proximity to water and the earth, so that its lower portions are cool, while its upper portions are warm.³

The wind blows as follows: from the northeast, Caecias, which is also called Meses; from the east, Apeliotes; from the southeast, Eurus; from the southwest, Lips; from the west, Zephyr; from the northwest, Argestes or Olympias, which is also called Japyx; then Notus, the south wind, and Aparctias, the north wind, blow in directions opposite to each other; and midway between Aparctias and Caecias is Boreas; midway between Eurus and Notus is Phoenix, which is called Euronotus; midway between Notus and Lips is Libonotus, which is also called Leuconotus; and midway between Arpactias and Argestes is Thrascias, or Cercius, as it is called by the local inhabitants.

(The races that inhabit the extreme confines are: to the east, the Bactrians; to the southeast, the Indians; to the south-southeast lie the Red Sea and Ethiopia; to the south-southwest, the Garamantes, who dwell beyond Syria; to the southwest, the Ethiopians and the West Moors; to the west

1 Gen. 1.2.

2 Cf. Severus Gabal., *Homily 1 on the Creation of the World* 5 (PG 56.436).

3 Cf. Nemesius, *op. cit.* 5 (PG 40.617B-620A).

lie the Pillars of Hercules and the confines of Lybia and Europe; to the northwest, Iberia, which is now called Spain; to the north-northwest, the Celts and bordering nations; to the north, the Scythians, who dwell beyond Thrace; to the north-northeast, Pontus, Maeotia, and the Sarmatians; to the northeast, the Caspian Sea and the Sacae.)⁴

Chapter 9

Water is also one of the four elements and a most admirable creation of God. Water is a wet and cold element which is heavy and unbouyant and which is fluid. Sacred Scripture refers to it when it says: 'And darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved over the waters,'¹ for the deep is nothing else but a great quantity of water. In the beginning, then, water covered the whole earth. And first God made the firmament that 'divided the waters that were above the firmament, from those that were under the firmament,'² for in the midst of the abyss of waters it was made firm by the Lord's command. Thus, God said for a firmament also to be made, and it was made. Why did God put water over the firmament? Because of the burning heat of the sun and the ether. For the ether is spread immediately under the firmament, and the sun and moon and stars are in the firmament; if water did not lie over it, the firmament would be burnt up by the heat.³

Then God ordered the waters to be gathered together into one place. Now, the fact that Scripture speaks of one gathering does not mean that they were gathered together into one place, for notice that after this it says: 'And the

4 This passage is not found in most codices.

1 Gen. 1.2.

2 Gen. 1.7.

3 Cf. Basil, *Homily 3 on the Six Days* 7 (PG 29.68ff.).

gathering together of the waters he called seas.⁴ Actually, the account meant that the waters were segregated by themselves apart from the earth. And so the waters were brought together into their gathering places and the dry land appeared. Thence came the two seas which surround Egypt, for Egypt lies between two seas. Various seas are gathered together, having mountains, islands, capes, and harbors, and bordering upon various bays, beaches and headlands. The sandy shore is called a beach, but the rocky and precipitous shore that extends directly into deep water is called a headland. Thence, also, in the same way were gathered together that sea to the east which is called the Indian, and that to the north called the Caspian, and the lakes.

Then there is the ocean which encircles the entire earth like a sort of river and to which it seems to me that Scripture referred when it said that 'a river went out of the place of pleasure.'⁵ It has a sweet potable water and supplies the seas, but because the water remains stagnant in the seas for a long time it becomes brackish. The sun and the water-spouts are constantly drawing up the less dense water and from this the clouds are formed and the rains come, the water becoming sweet by filtration.

This ocean is divided into four heads, or four rivers. The name of the first is Phison; this is the Ganges of India. The name of the second is Gehon; this is the Nile which comes down from Ethiopia into Egypt. The name of the third is Tigris, and of the fourth, Euphrates. There are also a great many other very large rivers, of which some empty into the sea, while others are absorbed into the earth. This is why the whole earth is porous and undermined, as if it had some sort of veins through which it receives water from the sea and sends it up in springs. The quality of the water of the springs corresponds with that of the earth, for, although the sea water is strained and filtered through the earth and thus is made sweet, yet, if the place from which the spring gushes

⁴ Gen. 1.9,10.

⁵ Gen. 2.10.

happens to be bitter or salty, the water will come up like the earth.⁶ Moreover, the water is oftentimes compressed and then bursts forth violently and becomes heated. This is the cause of the natural hot springs.

And so, by the divine command hollow places were made in the earth. Thus it was that the waters were brought together into their gathering places, and this is the cause of the mountains being made. Then God commanded the first-made water to bring forth life, because it was His intention to renew man by water and by that Holy Spirit which was borne over the waters in the beginning, which is what the divine Basil said.⁷ And it brought forth living things both small and great—whales, dragons, fish swimming in the waters, and winged fowl. Now, it is through the winged fowl that the water, earth, and air meet, for they were made from the water, they busy themselves upon the earth, and they fly in the air.⁸ Water is a most admirable element and has many uses, and it cleanses from filth, not only the bodily kind but the spiritual as well, provided the grace of the Spirit is added to it.

(The Aegean Sea empties into the Hellespont, which ends at Abydos and Sestos. Then comes the Propontis, which ends at Chalcedon and Byzantium. There the straits are which lead into the Black Sea, beyond which is Lake Maeotis. And again, at the confines of Europe and Lybia there is the Iberian Sea, which extends from the Pillars of Hercules to the Pyrenees. Then comes the Ligurian Sea, which extends as far as the limits of Etruria; then the Sardinian Sea extending from above Sardinia down toward Libya; and the Tyrrhenian Sea beginning at the limits of Liguria and ending at Sicily; then the Sea of Libya, then that of Crete, and that of Sicily, and the Ionian Sea, and the Adriatic, which flows out of the Sea of Sicily and which is called the Gulf of Corinth

6 Cf. Basil, *Homily 4 on the Six Days* 6 (PG 29.92C).

7 Gen. 1.2; Cf. Basil, *Homily 2 on the Six Days* 6 (PG 29.44B).

8 Cf. Basil, *Homily 8 on the Six Days* 2 (PG 29.168C-169A).

or the Alcyonian Sea. That between Sunium and Scyllaeum is the Saronic Sea. Then comes the Sea of Myrtos, and the Icarian Sea, in which are the Cyclades; then the Carpathian, the Pamphylian, and the Egyptian Seas. And beyond the Icarian Sea the Aegean extends on. The coastline of Europe from the mouth of the Tanais River⁹ to the Pillars of Hercules is 69,709 stades long. That of Libya from Tingis¹⁰ to the Canobic mouth of the Nile is 29,252 stades long. And that of Asia from Canobus to the Tanais River is 40,111 stades long, including the bays. Altogether the seaboard of our inhabited world, including the bays, is 139,072 stades long.¹¹ ¹²

Chapter 10

Earth is one of the four elements. It is dry and cold, heavy and inert, and it was brought from nothing into being by God on the first day. For 'in the beginning,' it says, 'God created heaven and earth.'¹ What its seat and foundation is no man has been able to tell. Some say that it was set upon the waters and made fast, because the divine David says: 'Who established the earth above the waters.'² Others say upon the air. Still another says: 'He hangeth the earth upon nothing.'³ And again the prophet David, speaking⁴ as in the person of the Creator, says: 'I have

9 The Don River.

10 Tangier.

11 The figures given by Lequien and reproduced by Migne are obviously erroneous; they neither add up correctly nor do they correspond at all with the estimates of the early geographers. The figures here given seem to be those originally intended, for they both agree with the Greek, allowing for some error in the copying of the numerical accents, and with the geographical estimates of the geographers (for which, cf. Strabo). They also add correctly.

12 This appendix is not found in all manuscripts.

1 Gen. 1.1.

2 Ps. 135.6.

3 Job 26.7.

4 Ps. 74.4, 23.2.

established the pillars thereof,' calling His sustaining power pillars. However, the assertion that 'he hath founded it upon the seas' makes it plain that the substance of water was poured round the earth on every side. But, whether we hold the earth to have been set upon itself, or upon air, or upon water, or upon nothing, we must not depart from the principles of religion and we must confess that all things are sustained and held together by the power of the Creator.

In the beginning, then, as sacred Scripture says,⁵ the earth was covered by the waters and was empty, that is to say, unadorned. But at God's command the receptacles for the waters were made. Then the mountains came into being and by the divine command the earth assumed its natural beauty and was adorned with every sort of verdure and plant. In these last the divine command implanted the power to grow, to absorb nourishment, and to seed, that is, to reproduce their kind. Then at the Creator's command there came forth every sort of animal: creeping things, and wild beasts, and cattle. Everything was for the suitable use of man. Of the animals, some were for food, such as deer, sheep, gazelles, and the like; some for work, such as camels, oxen, horses, asses, and the like; still others for diversion, such as monkeys and such birds as magpies, parrots, and the like. Of the plants and herbs, some were fruit-bearing and some edible, and some, such as the rose and the like, were fragrant and flowering and were given us for our enjoyment; and still others were given us for the curing of diseases. For there is no animal or plant in which the Creator has not put some virtue that is of use for the needs of man. He knew all things before they were made and He saw that man in his freedom would fall and be given over to corruption; yet for man's suitable use He made all the things that are in the sky and on the earth and in the water.

Before the fall, all things were subject to the control of man, because God had made him ruler over all the things

⁵ Gen. 1.2.

on the earth and in the water. And the serpent was on intimate terms with man, associating with him more than all the rest and conversing agreeably with him. For that reason it was through it that the Devil, who is the source of evil, made that most evil suggestion to our first parents.⁶ At that time the earth brought forth of itself fruits for the use of the animals that were subject to man, and there were neither violent rains upon the earth nor wintry storms. But, after the fall, 'when he was compared to senseless beasts, and was become like to them,'⁷ and when he had caused the unreasoning desire within himself to prevail over his rational intellect and had become disobedient to the commandment of the Lord, then the creation subject to him rose up against this ruler appointed by the Creator, and he was ordered to work in the sweat of his face the earth from which he had been taken.⁸

Nevertheless, the usefulness of the wild beasts is not even now past, because by exciting fear they bring man to recognize the God who made them and to call upon Him for help. Furthermore, after the fall, thorns grew out of the earth, as the Lord had declared.⁹ Later, the thorn was joined to the sweetness of the rose to remind us of that fall on account of which the earth had been condemned to bring forth thorns and thistles for us.¹⁰

Indeed, that such is the case is credible from the fact that their continuance is being assured down to the present time by those words spoken by the Lord when He said: 'Increase and multiply and fill the earth.'¹¹

Some say that the earth is spherical in form; others, that it is conical. It is lower than the heavens, and much smaller, being hung like a small point at their center. And it will

6 Cf. Gen. 3.1.

7 Ps. 48.13.

8 Cf. Gen. 3.19.

9 Cf. Gen. 3.18.

10 Cf. Basil, *Sermon on Paradise* 4 (PG 30.65A).

11 Gen. 1.28.

pass away and be changed.¹² Blessed is he who inherits the earth of the meek, for the earth which is to receive the saints is unending.¹³ Who, then, could sufficiently admire the boundless and incomprehensible wisdom of the Creator? Or who could adequately thank the Giver of good things?

(There are, furthermore, the known provinces of the earth, or satrapies, of which Europe has thirty-four, and the great continent of Asia forty-eight, and twelve canons.¹⁴)¹⁵

Chapter 11

Since God intended to fashion man after His own image and likeness from the visible and invisible creation to be a sort of king and ruler over the whole earth and the things in it, He prepared a sort of kingdom for him, in which he might dwell and lead a blessed and blissful life.¹ And this divine paradise prepared in *Eden* by the hands of God was a treasure house of every joy and pleasure. For 'Eden' is interpreted as meaning 'delight.' It was situated in the east and was higher than all the rest of the earth. It was temperate in climate and bright with the softest and purest of air. It was luxuriant with ever-blooming plants, filled with fragrance, flooded with light, and surpassing all conception of sensible fairness and beauty. In truth, it was a divine place and a worthy habitation for God in His image. And in it no brute beasts dwelt, but only man, the handiwork of God.²

¹² Cf. Apoc. 21.1.

¹³ Cf. Matt. 5.4.

¹⁴ *District*, a rare use of the word *canon*. Here it probably refers to the dioceses of the Roman Empire, the principal function of which came to be the collection and transmission of the 'canon' or regular taxes.

¹⁵ This paragraph is missing in most codices.

¹ Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Making of Man* 2 (PG 44.132-133).

² Cf. Basil, *Sermon on Paradise* 2 (PG 30.64).

In its midst God planted a tree of life and a tree of knowledge.³ He planted the tree of knowledge as a sort of trial, test, and exercise of man's obedience and disobedience. It is either for this reason that it has been called the tree of knowledge of good and evil, or because it gave to them that partook of it the power to know their own nature—which, while it is good for the perfect, is bad for them that are less perfect and more given to their desires, as strong meat is to them that are tender and still in need of milk.⁴ For God who created us did not want us to be 'careful and troubled about many things,'⁵ nor to be anxious and concerned for our own life—which is just what happened to Adam. Thus, after he had eaten, he became aware of the fact that he was naked and put an apron around himself. For he took fig leaves and girded himself, although before they had eaten 'they were both naked, to wit, Adam and Eve, and they were not ashamed.'⁶ God wanted us to be dispassionate like that, for that is passionlessness to the highest degree. And He also wanted us to be free from care and to have but one task, that of the angels, which is unceasingly and unremittingly to sing the praises of the Creator and to rejoice in contemplating Him. He also wanted us to cast our cares upon Him, which is just what He told us through the Prophet David, saying: 'Cast thy care upon the Lord, and he shall sustain thee.'⁷ In the Gospels, too, when teaching His own disciples, He says:⁸ 'Be not solicitous for your life, what you shall eat, nor for your body, what you shall put on'; and again: 'Seek ye the kingdom of God and his justice, and all these things shall be added unto you'; and to Martha: 'Martha, Martha, thou art careful and troubled about many things: but one thing is necessary. Mary hath chosen the

³ Cf. Gen. 2.9.

⁴ Heb. 5.12; Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 38.12 (PG 36.324BC), and *Sermon* 45.8 (PG 36.632-633).

⁵ Luke 10.41.

⁶ Gen. 2.25.

⁷ Ps. 54.23.

⁸ Matt. 6.25,33; Luke 10.41,42.

best part, which shall not be taken away from her,' namely, to sit at His feet and hear His words.

The tree of life was either a tree possessing a life-giving force or a tree that was to be eaten of only by such as were worthy of life and not subject to death. Some have imagined paradise to have been material, while others have imagined it to have been spiritual. However, it seems to me that, just as man was created both sensitive and intellectual, so did this most sacred domain of his have the twofold aspect of being perceptible both to the senses and to the mind. For, while in his body he dwelt in this most sacred and superbly beautiful place, as we have related, spiritually he resided in a loftier and far more beautiful place. There he had the indwelling God as a dwelling place and wore Him as a glorious garment. He was wrapped about with His grace, and, like some one of the angels, he rejoiced in the enjoyment of that one most sweet fruit which is the contemplation of God, and by this he was nourished. Now, this is indeed what is fittingly called the tree of life, for the sweetness of divine contemplation communicates a life uninterrupted by death to them that partake of it. It is just this that God meant by 'every tree' when He said: 'Of every tree of paradise thou shalt eat.'⁹ For He is the all, in whom and by whom the universe endures.

The tree of knowledge of good and evil is the power of discernment by multiple vision, and this is the complete knowing of one's own nature. Of itself it manifests the magnificence of the Creator and it is good for them that are full-grown and have walked in the contemplation of God—for them that have no fear of changing, because in the course of time they have acquired a certain habit of such contemplation. It is not good, however, for such as are still young and are more greedy in their appetites, who, because of the uncertainty of their perseverance in the true good and because of their not yet being solidly established in their

9 Gen. 2.16.

application to the only good, are naturally inclined to be drawn away and distracted by their solicitude for their own bodies.¹⁰

It is in such a way that I think that the divine paradise was of a twofold nature, and the inspired Fathers taught rightly, both those who taught the one aspect and those who taught the other. Moreover, it is possible to take 'every tree' as meaning the knowledge of the divine power which comes from the things that have been created, as the divine Apostle says: 'For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made.'¹¹ Of all these thoughts and considerations, the loftiest are those which concern ourselves—which concern our constitution, I mean, as the divine David says: 'Thy knowledge from myself is become wonderful,'¹² that is to say, 'from my own make-up.' In the newly made Adam, however, this was dangerous—for the reasons we have stated.

Again, the tree of life may be taken as the greater understanding of God that comes from all material things, and the process of induction leading from these to the productive and creative cause of them all. And it is just this that is called 'every tree,' the whole and undivided tree that brings the only participation in the Good. And by the tree of knowledge of good and evil may be understood that material and enjoyable food which, while seeming to be sweet, actually makes the partaker to be a partaker of evil. For God says:¹³ 'Of every tree of paradise thou shalt eat,' meaning, I think: By means of all created things be thou drawn up to Me, their Creator, and from them reap the one fruit which is Myself, who am the true life; let all things be fruitful life to thee and make participation in Me to be the substance of thy own existence; for thus thou shalt be immortal.

10 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *loc. cit.*

11 Rom. 1.20.

12 Ps. 138.6 (Septuagint).

13 Gen. 2.16,17.

‘But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat. For in what day soever thou shalt eat of it, thou shall die the death.’ For it is of the nature of material food to replace that which has been consumed, and it is voided into the privy and so to corruption. And it is impossible for him who partakes of material food to remain incorruptible.

Chapter 12

Thus, then, God created the intellectual substance. By that I mean angels and all the heavenly orders, for these quite plainly have an intellectual and incorporeal nature. When I say incorporeal, I mean incorporeal in comparison with the grossness of matter, for only the Divinity is really immaterial and incorporeal. Besides this, He also created the material substance, that is to say, the heavens and the earth and the things that lie between them. The former of these substances is akin to Him, for the rational nature which can only be grasped by the intellect is akin to God; while the latter, in so far as it is manifestly perceptible to the senses, is very very far removed from Him. ‘But, as a mark of greater wisdom and of His munificence toward created natures, it was also necessary that a combination of both substances should be made,’ as the inspired Gregory says, ‘as a sort of bond between the visible and invisible natures.’¹ The phrase ‘it was necessary,’ I say, implies the intention of the Creator, for this intention is a most fit law and ordinance. Thus, no one will ask the molder: ‘Why did you make me like this?’—for the potter has the power to make different vessels from the same lump of clay² in accordance with the dictates of his own wisdom.

Since this was the case, with His own hands He created *man* after His own image and likeness from the visible and

¹ Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 38.11 (PG 36.321D).

² Cf. Rom. 9.21.

invisible natures. From the earth He formed his body and by His own inbreathing gave him a rational and understanding soul, which last we say is the divine image—for the 'according to His image' means the intellect and free will, while the 'according to His likeness' means such likeness in virtue as is possible.

The body and the soul were formed at the same time—not one before and the other afterwards, as the ravings of Origen would have it.

And so God made man innocent, straightforward, virtuous, free from pain, free from care, ornamented with every virtue, and adorned with all good qualities. He made him a sort of miniature world within the larger one, another adoring angel, a compound, an eye-witness of the visible creation, an initiate of the invisible creation, lord of the things of earth, lorded over from on high, earthly and heavenly, passing and immortal, visible and spiritual, halfway between greatness and lowliness, at once spirit and flesh—spirit by grace and flesh by pride, the first that he might endure and give glory to his Benefactor, and the second that he might suffer and by suffering be reminded and instructed not to glory in his greatness. He made him a living being to be governed here according to this present life, and then to be removed elsewhere, that is, to the world to come, and so to complete the mystery by becoming divine through reversion to God—this, however, not by being transformed into the divine substance, but by participation in the divine illumination.³

He moreover made him sinless and endowed with freedom of will. By being sinless I do not mean being incapable of sinning, for only the Divinity is incapable of sinning, but having the tendency to sin not in his nature but, rather, in his power of choice—that is to say, having the power to persevere and progress in good with the help of divine grace, as well as having the power to turn from virtue and fall into vice, God

³ Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *op. cit.* 11 (PG 36.324A).

permitting because of the freedom of the will. For, that which is done by force is not an act of virtue.

Now, a soul is a living substance, simple and incorporeal, of its own nature invisible to bodily eyes, activating an organic body in which it is able to cause life, growth, sensation, and reproduction. It does not have the mind as something distinct from itself, but as its purest part, for, as the eye is to the body, so is the mind to the soul. It is free, endowed with will and the power to act, and subject to change, that is, subject to change of will, because it is also created. And this it has received according to nature, through that grace of the Creator by which it has also received both its existence and its being naturally as it is.

[In how many ways a thing may be said to be incorporeal.⁴]

Things that are incorporeal, invisible and without shape we conceive of in two ways. Some are so by essence and some by grace; some are so by nature and some by comparison with the grossness of matter. Thus, God is said to be incorporeal by nature, but the angels, evil spirits, and souls are said to be so by grace and by comparison with the grossness of matter.

A body is three-dimensional, that is, having height, breadth, and depth or thickness. Every body is composed of the four elements, but the bodies of living things are composed of the four humors.

One should note that the four elements are: earth, which is dry and cold; water, which is cold and wet; air, which is wet and warm; and fire, which is warm and dry. Likewise, there are also four humors corresponding to the four elements: black bile, which corresponds to the earth, because it is dry and cold; phlegm, which corresponds to the water, because it is cold and wet; blood, which corresponds to the air, because it is wet and warm; yellow bile, which corresponds

4 A marginal addition.

to fire, because it is warm and dry. Now, while fruits are made from the elements, the humors are made from the fruits, and the bodies of living things are made from the humors and are reducible to the elements, for every compound is reducible to them.

[*That man has something in common with the inanimate, the irrational, and the rational beings.*⁵]

One should note that man has something in common with inanimate things, that he shares life with the rational living beings, and that he shares understanding with the rational. In common with inanimate things, he has his body and its composition from the four elements. In common with the plants, he has these same things plus the power of assimilating nourishment, of growing and of semination of generation. In common with the brute beasts, he has all these plus appetite—that is to say, anger and desire—sensation, and spontaneous movement.

Now, the senses are five; namely, sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch. Belonging to spontaneous movement are the power of moving from place to place, that of moving the entire body, and that of speech and breathing—for in us we have the power either to do these things or not to do them.

Through his power of reason man is akin to the incorporeal and intellectual natures, reasoning, thinking, judging each thing, and pursuing the virtues, particularly the acme of the virtues which is religion. For this reason, man is also a microcosm.

One should note that section, flux, and change are proper to the body alone.⁶ *Change* is that which is in quality, such as being heated, cooled, and so forth. *Flux* is an emptying out, for solids, liquids, and the breath are voided and then

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Cf. Nemesius, *On the Nature of Man* 1 (PG 40516C).

need to be replaced. Consequently, hunger and thirst are natural sensations. *Section* is the separation of the humors from one another and the division into matter and form.

Proper to the soul are religion and understanding. Although the virtues are referred to the soul, yet, in so far as the soul utilizes the body, they are common to both.

One should note that the rational part of the soul governs the irrational part. Indeed, the faculties of the soul are divided into those belonging to its rational part and those belonging to its irrational part. There are two groups belonging to the irrational part, of which one is deaf to reason, that is to say, does not obey the reason, whereas the other listens to the reason and complies with it. Now, deaf and disobedient to reason are the vital principle, which is also called pulsating, the seminal or generative principle, and the vegetable principle, which is also called nutritive and to which also belongs the principle of growth that builds up the body. For these are governed not by reason but by nature. The group listening to reason and complying with it is divided into anger and desire. Moreover, the irrational part of the soul is commonly called emotional and appetitive. And one should know that the faculty of spontaneous movement is one of those which are obedient to reason.

To those which are not obedient to reason belong the nutritive, the generative, and the pulsating principles. The growing, nutritive, and generative principles are called vegetable; the pulsating is called vital.

The nutritive principle has four faculties: the attractive, which attracts the food; the retentive, which retains the food and does not permit it to be excreted immediately; the transformative, which changes the food into the humors; and the excretive, which separates the superfluity and expels it through the rectum.⁷

One should note that some of the faculties in the living being are animal, some vegetable, and some vital. The

7 Cf. *ibid.* 23 (PG 40.693A).

animal faculties are those which depends upon choice; namely, spontaneous movement and sense. To spontaneous movement belong moving from place to place, moving the entire body, speaking, and breathing, for it is in our power either to do them or not. Vegetable and vital faculties are those which do not depend upon choice. The nutritive, growing, and generative faculties are vegetable, while the pulsating faculty is vital. These all operate regardless of whether we want them to or not.

Furthermore, one must note that some things are good and others evil. Now, when a good thing is expected, it gives rise to desire, but when it is present it causes pleasure. Similarly, when a bad thing is expected, it gives rise to fear, but when it is present it causes pain. One must also understand that, when we say 'good' here, we mean both that which is really good and that which is apparently so, and similarly, when we say 'bad.'

Chapter 13

Some *pleasures*¹ are of the soul, while others are of the body. Of the soul are all those which belong to the soul alone as distinct from the body, such as those coming from learning and contemplation. Bodily pleasures are those which are shared by the soul and the body. For this reason, all those coming from eating, sexual intercourse, and the like, are called bodily. However, one would not find any pleasures belonging to the body alone.

Again, some pleasures are true, whereas others are false. Some pleasures, also, which come from knowledge and contemplation, are purely intellectual; others, arising from sensation, are shared by the body. Of the pleasures shared by the body, some are both natural and necessary. Without these it would be impossible to live; such are food eaten to supply a deficiency, and necessary clothes. Still others are natural

1 Cf. *ibid.* 18 (PG 40.677ff.).

but not necessary, such as natural and legitimate sexual relations. For, although these last do assure the permanency of the entire race, it is nevertheless possible to live in virginity without them. Still others are neither necessary nor natural, such as intoxicating liquors, lewdness, and surfeits that exceed our needs. These do nothing for the maintenance of our life or for perpetuation of the race; on the contrary, they do harm. Hence, he who lives according to God must seek those pleasures which are both necessary and natural, while those which are natural but not necessary he must relegate to second place and only indulge in them as permitted by the suitability of time, manner, and moderation. The others, however, must be absolutely rejected.

Such pleasures may be considered to be good as do not involve pain, cause remorse, do any damage, exceed the limits of moderation, distract us for long from good works, or enslave us.

Chapter 14

There are four kinds of *pain*;¹ namely, grief, distress, envy, and compassion. *Grief* is a pain which makes one speechless; *distress* is one which oppresses; envy is one arising from another's good fortune; and *compassion* is one arising from another's misfortune.

Chapter 15

*Fear*¹ also has its divisions, which are six; namely, apprehension, diffidence, shame, terror, consternation, and anxiety. *Apprehension* is fear of something which is going to happen. *Diffidence* is a fear due to an expected reproach, and this is an excellent affection. *Shame* is a fear due to the perpetra-

¹ Cf. *ibid.* 19 (PG 40.688).

¹ Cf. *ibid.* 20 (PG 40.688ff.).

tion of a shameful act, nor is this beyond hope of salvation. *Terror* is a fear arising from a strong mental impression. *Consternation* is a fear arising from an unaccustomed mental impression. *Anxiety* is a fear of failure, that is to say, of misfortune—for when we are afraid that our undertaking will turn out badly, we are anxious.

Chapter 16

*Anger*¹ is a seething of the blood about the heart caused by the fuming up or thickening of the bile. For this reason, it is also called bile or spleen. There is also a kind of anger which is a desire for revenge, for when we are wronged or think that we have been wronged, we are pained and there arises in us that combined feeling of desire and anger.

There are three kinds of anger; namely, wrath (which is called bile and spleen), rancor, and vindictiveness. When anger arises and starts to move, it is called *wrath*, *bile*, and *spleen*. *Rancor* is an enduring wrath, or bearing malice. It is called μῆνις from its μένειν, or remaining, and being impressed upon the memory. *Vindictiveness* is wrath on the watch for an opportunity for revenge. It is called κότος from κείσθαι, or being laid down.

Anger is the spearman of the reason and the avenger of desire. Thus, when we desire a thing and are thwarted by someone, our reason decides that for such as would maintain their own natural position this occurrence is worthy of vexation, and we get angry at him over our having been wronged.

Chapter 17

The *imagination*¹ is the faculty belonging to the irrational part of the soul. It acts through the sense organs and is

¹ Cf. *ibid.* 21 (PG 40.692).

called a sensation. Moreover, that which comes within the province of the imagination and the senses is the imaginative and the sensible, just as the visible—say, a stone or something of the sort—comes within the province of sight, which is the power of vision. An *imagination*, or fantasy, is an affection of the irrational part of the soul arising from some imagineable object. But an *imagining*, or phantasm, is an empty affection arising in the irrational parts of the soul from no imagineable object at all. The organ of the imagination is the anterior ventricle of the brain.

Chapter 18

Sense is a faculty of the soul by which material things are perceived, or distinguished. The sense organs are the organs or members by means of which we perceive. *Sensible* things are those which come within the province of the senses. The animal endowed with sense is *sensitive*. There are five senses and, likewise, five sense organs.

The first sense is that of *sight*.¹ The sense organs or media of sight are the nerves leading from the brain and the eyes. Fundamentally, it is the visual impression of color that is received, but along with the color the sight distinguishes the colored body, also: its size and shape, the place where it is and the intervening distance, its number, its motion or motionlessness, its roughness or smoothness, its evenness or unevenness, sharpness or bluntness, and whether it has the consistency of water or that of earth; in other words, whether it is liquid or solid.

The second sense is that of *hearing*.² This is capable of discerning voices and sounds, of which it distinguishes the high or low pitch, the degree of smoothness, and the volume. Its organs are the soft nerves leading from the brain and the

¹ Cf. *ibid.* 7 (PG 40.637ff.).

² Cf. *ibid.* 10 (PG 40.657).

apparatus of the ears. Moreover, only man and the monkey do not move their ears.

The third sense is that of *smell*,³ which originates with the nose sending the odors up to the brain and is terminated at the extremities of the anterior ventricles of the brain. The sense of smell is capable of discerning and perceiving odors. The most general division of odors is into sweet-smelling and foul-smelling and that which stands midway between these and is neither the one nor the other. Thus, a sweet smell arises when the juices in bodies have been cooked to a nicety. When they have been cooked middling well, the result is middling. But when they have been very poorly or incompletely cooked, then there is a foul smell.

The fourth sense is that of *taste*.⁴ This sense is capable of perceiving or discerning flavors. Its organs are the tongue—especially its tip—and the palate, which some call the roof [of the mouth]. The nerves leading from the brain have been broadened out in these and report back to the authoritative part of the soul the impression or sensation received. The so-called taste qualities or flavors are as follows: sweetness, bitterness, acidity, sourness, tartness, pungency, saltiness, greasiness, and stickiness. For it is these that the sense of taste can distinguish. Water, however, in so far as these qualities are concerned, is tasteless, because it has none of them. Sourness is an intense and excessive tartness.

The fifth sense is that of *touch*,⁵ which is common to all animals. It comes from the nerves leading out from the brain into the entire body, for which reason both the entire body and the other sense organs, too, possess the sense of touch. Subject to touch are heat and cold, softness and hardness, stickiness and friability, and heaviness and lightness, because these things are recognized only by the sense of touch. Common to both the sense of touch and that of sight

3 Cf. *ibid.* 11 (PG 40.657-658).

4 Cf. *ibid.* 9 (PG 40.656-657).

5 Cf. *ibid.* 8 (PG 40.649ff.).

are: roughness and smoothness; dryness and wetness; thickness and thinness; up and down; place; size, whenever it is such as can be determined with one application of the sense of touch; compactness and looseness, or density; roundness, if on a small scale, and various other shapes. Similarly, with the aid of the memory and the understanding, it can also perceive the approach of a body, as well as number, too, up to two or three, provided the objects be small and easily grasped. Sight, however, is more perceptive of these than is touch.

One should note that the Creator constructed each one of the sense organs in pairs,⁶ so that, should one be harmed, the other might fulfill the function. Thus, there are two eyes, two ears, two nostrils, and two tongues. These last, however, while they are separate in some animals, such as snakes, in others, such as man, are joined together. On the other hand, the sense of touch is in the entire body, with the exception of the bones, nerves, nails and horns, hair, sinews, and certain other parts of the same sort.

One should note that sight sees along straight lines, but that smell and hearing get their impressions not only along straight lines, but from all directions. Touch and taste, however, get their impressions neither along straight lines nor along any line, but only when their proper organs are in contact with their objects.

Chapter 19

To the *thinking faculty*¹ belong judgments, assents, inclinations and disinclinations to act, and avoidances of action. In particular, concepts of intellectual things, the virtues and sciences, the principles of the arts, and the deliberative and

6 Cf. *ibid.* (PG 40.649A).

1 Cf. *ibid.* 12 (PG 40.660).

elective powers belong to the thinking faculty. It is also this faculty which foretells the future to us through dreams, which the Pythagoreans, following in the steps of the Hebrews, claim to be the only true divination. The organ of this faculty is the middle ventricle of the brain and the vital spirit residing therein.

Chapter 20

The faculty of *memory*¹ is both the cause and the repository of memory and recollection. Memory is an image which has been left behind by some sensory or mental impression that has actually been received. In other words, it is the retention of sensation and thought. Thus, on the one hand, the soul apprehends or senses sensible objects through the organs of sense, and a mental impression is formed; on the other hand, it apprehends intellectual objects through the mind and a conjecture is formed. Hence, when it retains the forms of things of which it has received impressions, or of things of which it has thought, then it is said to remember.

One must note that the apprehension of intellectual things comes only through learning, or the natural process of thinking. It does not come from sensation, because sensible things are remembered in themselves, whereas intellectual things we do remember, provided we have learned something of them, but of their substance we have no memory.

Recollection is the recovery of memory that has been lost by forgetting, and forgetting is the loss of memory. When the imaginative faculty has apprehended material things by means of the senses, it communicates [the impression] to the thinking faculty, or reasoning faculty—for both of these are the same thing. When this faculty has received the impression and formed a judgment of it, it passes it on to the faculty of memory. The organ of the faculty of memory is the posterior ventricle of the brain, which is also called the cerebellum, and the vital spirit residing therein.

Chapter 21

The speaking (or rational) part of the soul is again divided into *mental and spoken speech*.¹ Mental speech is a movement of the soul made in its reasoning faculty without any vocal expression. Thus, we oftentimes go silently through an entire discourse in detail, and we converse in our dreams. In this respect we are all speaking (or rational) in the most proper sense. For, certainly, those who have been born dumb or who have lost their voice through some illness or accident are by no means less rational. Spoken speech acts through the voice and language, that is to say, it is the speech which is spoken by means of the tongue and mouth. For this reason it is said to be spoken. It is, moreover, the messenger of thought. In respect to this faculty we are also said to be talking.

Chapter 22

The term *passion* is equivocal, because, while it may refer to the body, as in the case of sickness and sores, it may also refer to the soul, as with desire or anger. In its common and general sense, however, it means an animal passion such as is followed by pleasure or pain. Now, pain does follow passion, but pain is not the passion itself, because insensible things, when they suffer, do not feel pain. Thus, then, pain is not passion but the feeling of passion. This passion, moreover, must be considerable, that is to say, so intense as to come within the province of sensation.

The definition of the passions of the soul is as follows: passion is a movement of the appetitive faculty which is felt as a result of a sensory impression of good or evil.¹ It may also be defined in another way: passion is an irrational move-

¹ Cf. *ibid.* 14 (PG 40.665ff.).

¹ Cf. *ibid.* 16 (PG 40.673B).

ment of the soul due to an impression of good or evil. Thus, the impression of good arouses the desire, whereas that of evil arouses the anger. Passion in the general or common sense is defined thus: passion is a movement in one thing caused by another. But *action* is an active movement, that being called *active* which moves of itself. Hence, when one is driven violently into action by anger, this anger is, on the one hand, an action of the irascible part of the soul; on the other, it is a *passion* of both parts, and of the entire body as well. For [in this last case] the movement in one thing has been caused by another, which is precisely what is called passion.

In still another way, action is called passion. For, while action is a movement according to nature, passion is a movement against nature. So, for this reason, action is called passion when one is not moved according to nature, whether by himself or by another. Thus, the pulsating movement of the heart is action, because it is natural; but its palpitating movement, because it is immoderate and not according to nature, is passion and not action.

Not every movement of the passible part of the soul is called a passion, but only the more violent ones which come within the range of sensation, because the little imperceptible ones are not passions at all. The passion must also have a considerable intensity. Consequently, a perceptible movement comes under the definition of passion, but the little movements which elude sensation do not make for passion.

One should note that our soul possesses two kinds of faculties: the *cognitive* and the *vital*. The cognitive faculties are mind, thought, opinion, imagination, and sensation. Will and choice, on the other hand, are vital, or appetitive, faculties. To make what has just been said more clear, let us discuss these things in detail. First of all, let us speak about the cognitive faculties.

Imagination and sensation have already been sufficiently discussed in what has been said before. Thus, through *sensa-*

tion a passion is caused in the soul and this is called *imagination*. From imagination there arises an *opinion*. Then, when the thinking faculty has examined the opinion as to whether it is true or false, it decides what is true. For this reason, this faculty is called *thought* from its thinking and discerning. That which has been judged and set down as true is called *mind*.

Or, to put it in another way—one should note that the first movement of the mind is called *intelligence*. Intelligence being exercised about something is called *thinking*. When this has continued a while and has impressed the soul with the thing thought about, it is called *consideration*. And when the consideration has continued in the same subject and has thoroughly examined itself and interrogated the soul in regard to the thing thought about, then it is called *prudence* [or practical wisdom]. Then prudence extends on and produces *reasoning*, which is termed mental speech, and which they define as a most complete movement of the soul arising in its reasoning part without any vocal expression. It is from this that they say that the spoken word expressed by the tongue proceeds. And so, now that we have spoken about the cognitive faculties, let us speak of the vital, or appetitive faculties.

One should note that in the soul there is an innate force appetitive of what is natural to the soul and embracing all those things which pertain to its nature essentially. This is called *will* (θέλησις). The substance [of the soul] tends to exist and live, to think and feel; and it desires its own natural and complete actuality. This is why the natural will is defined as follows: Will is a rational and vital appetite attached solely to natural things.² Hence, the will is the same natural, vital, and rational appetite for everything that goes to make up the nature; it is a simple faculty. The appetite of brute animals is not called a will, because it is not rational.

Wishing (βούλησις) is a sort of natural willing, that is

2 Cf. Maximus, *Opuscula theologica ad Marinum* (PG 91.12C).

to say, a natural and rational appetite for some thing. For, inherent in the human soul, there is a faculty for rationally desiring. And so, when this rational appetite is moved toward some thing, it is called volition, for wishing is a rational appetition and desiring for something.

We speak of wishing both in respect to things which are in our power and in respect to things which are not; in other words, in respect to possible and impossible things. Thus, oftentimes we may wish to fornicate, or to exercise self-control, or to sleep, or some other such thing. These things are in our power and are possible. On the other hand, we may also wish to be a king, and that is not in our power. Then, possibly, we may wish never to die, and that is an impossible thing.

Wishing concerns the end, and not the means to the end. Now, the end is the thing desired, such as to be king or to enjoy good health, whereas the means to the end is the thing deliberated, or the way in which we may become healthy or get to be king.³ Immediately after wishing come inquiry and consideration. Then, after these, provided the thing is within our power, comes deliberation, or counsel. *Deliberation* is an inquisitive appetite arising in respect to such things which are to be done as are in our power. Thus, one deliberates as to whether or not he should pursue the object. Then he decides which is the better course, and this is called *judgment*. Then he becomes disposed to the thing decided as a result of the deliberation and prefers it, and this is called *opinion*. For, should one judge and not become disposed to the thing judged, that is to say, not prefer it, then it is not called opinion. Then, after this disposition, there comes *choice* or selection. Choice is the choosing and picking out of this one rather than the other of two things proposed. Then one moves to act, and this is called *impulse*. Then one enjoys, and this is called *use*. Then, after the use, the appetite ceases.

³ Cf. *ibid.* (PG 91.13C-16A).

Now, in the case of the brute animals, when an appetite for something arises it is immediately followed by an impulse to act. This is because the appetite of brute animals is irrational and because they are led by their natural appetite. For this reason the appetite of brute animals is said to be neither a will nor a volition. Will is a rational and free natural appetite and with men, who are rational, the natural appetite is led rather than leads. Thus, man is moved freely with the aid of reason, since in him the cognitive and vital faculties are joined together. Hence, he freely desires and freely wills, freely lives and inquires, freely deliberates, freely judges, freely disposes himself, freely chooses, freely moves to act, and freely acts in respect to those things which are in accord with his nature.

One should note that, while we speak of wishing in God, in the strict sense we do not speak of choice. For God does not deliberate, because deliberation is due to ignorance. No one deliberates about what he knows. But, if deliberation is due to ignorance, then choice, too, is most certainly so. Hence, since God knows all things absolutely, He does not deliberate.

Neither do we speak of deliberation or choice in the soul of the Lord, because He did not suffer from ignorance.⁴ Even though He did have such a nature as was ignorant of future events, nevertheless, in so far as this nature was hypostatically united to God the Word, it did have knowledge of all things—not by grace, but, as has been said, by virtue of the hypostatic union. Thus, He was Himself both God and man, and therefore did not have a will based upon opinion. He did have a will that was natural and simple and such as is to be found in all human persons, but His sacred soul held no opinion, that is to say, willed nothing contrary to His divine will, nor did it have a will in opposition to His divine will. Now, opinion varies with the persons except in the case of the sacred, simple, uncompounded, and undivided

4 Cf. Maximus, *Disputatio cum Pyrrho* (PG 91.308-309).

Godhead. For, since the Persons there are by no means divided and set at variance, neither is the object of their will divided. And since there is but one nature there, there is, likewise, only one natural will. Moreover, since, again, the Persons are not at variance, there is one thing willed and one movement of the three Persons. But with men, while there is one nature and, consequently, one natural will, yet, since the persons are separate and varying from one another in time and place, in their disposition toward things, and in very many other ways, for this reason their wills and opinions differ. Now, since in the case of our Lord Jesus Christ the natures are different, so also are the natural wills of His divinity and humanity different, that is to say, the willing faculties. Since, however, there is but one Person and but one who wills, then the thing willed, or the will based on opinion, must also be one—with His human will, of course, following His divine will and willing those things which the divine will has willed it to will.

One should note that will is one thing and wishing another, and that the thing willed is one thing, the principle willing another, and the one willing still another. Whereas will is the simple faculty itself of willing, wishing is the will in regard to something, and the thing willed is the object of the will, or that which we will. For instance, the appetite tends to food. In this case, the simple acting appetite is a rational will, while the willing principle is that which possesses the faculty of willing, such as a man, and the one willing is he who uses the will.

One must bear in mind that when will means the will, or willing faculty, it is said to be a natural will; but that when it means the thing willed, then it is said to be will based on opinion.

Chapter 23

One should note that all the faculties heretofore discussed are called *acts*, whether they be the cognitive, the vital, the natural, or the technical. Act is the natural force and movement of any substance. Again, *natural act* is the innate movement of every substance. Whence it is clear that those things that have the same substance have also the same act, whereas those that have different natures have different acts. For it is inconceivable that a substance should be devoid of natural act.¹

Again, that force which is indicative of any substance is natural act. Still again, the first ever-moving force of the intellectual soul, that is to say, the ever-moving reason perpetually springing naturally from it, is natural act. Still again, the force and movement of any substance, which only non-being does not have, is natural act.

Moreover, such actions as talking, walking, eating, drinking, and the like are also called acts. And the natural passions, too, such as hunger, thirst, and the like are frequently called acts. And, finally, the actuation of potency is called act.

There are, moreover, two ways in which a thing is said to be: in potency and in act. Thus, we say that a suckling child is potentially lettered, because it has the capacity to become so through instruction. Again, we say that a lettered person is both potentially and actually so. He is actually so, because he has the knowledge of letters; but he is potentially so, if, although he can expound, he actually is not doing so. Again, we say that he is lettered actually when he is acting, that is to say, expounding. Consequently, one should note that this second way of being is common to both potency and act, but that the second belongs rather to potency, whereas the first belongs to act.

A first, only, and true natural act is that independent, or

¹ Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *The Guide* (PG 89.65B); Maximus, *Disputatio cum Pyrrho* (PG 91.337A).

rational, and free life which constitutes our species. When some people deprive our Lord of this, I do not understand how they say that He who is God became man.

Act is an active movement of nature. And that is called active which is moved of itself.

Chapter 24

Since it is in some action that the *voluntary* consists,¹ and also in some action that the involuntary in the commonly accepted sense of the term consists, there are many who put the involuntary in the absolute sense not only under passion but also under action. However, one must bear in mind that an action is a rational act. Actions incur praise or blame. The performance of some is accompanied by pleasure; of others, by pain. Some of them are desirable to the doer, whereas others are distasteful. Moreover, some of those which are desirable are always so, whereas others are so only at certain times. And it is the same with those which are distasteful. Then again, some actions are worthy of mercy and forgiveness, while others are detestable and to be punished. Therefore, concomitant with the absolutely voluntary are praise or blame, its performance with pleasure, and the fact that the actions are desirable to them that perform them, whether at all times or only at the particular time when they are performed. On the other hand, concomitant with the involuntary are the facts of the actions being worthy of forgiveness or mercy, or their being performed with pain, and of their not being desirable to the doer, whether because of his not doing them of his own accord or because of his being forced.

Now, the *involuntary*² is due either to compulsion or to

1 Cf. Nemesius, *op. cit.* 29 (PG 40.717-718).

2 Cf. *ibid.* 30 (PG 40.720ff.).

ignorance. It is due to compulsion when the efficient principle, or cause, is extrinsic—in other words, when we are compelled by another without our full agreement, without the concurrence of our own impulse, and without our co-operating or doing of our own accord the thing that we have been compelled to do. In defining it we say that that is involuntary of which the principle is extrinsic and in which the one compelled does not concur with his own impulse. By *principle* we mean the efficient cause. On the other hand, the involuntary is due to ignorance when we ourselves do not furnish the cause of the ignorance, and the thing just happens by chance. Thus, should someone commit murder while drunk, he would be doing it unwittingly, but certainly not involuntarily, because he himself has supplied the cause of the ignorance, that is to say, the drunkenness. If, however, someone has been shooting arrows in an accustomed place and has killed his father who had chanced by, he is said to have done this involuntarily through ignorance.³

And so, since there are two kinds of involuntary, that due to compulsion and that due to ignorance, the voluntary is opposed to both.⁴ Thus, that is voluntary which is brought about by neither compulsion nor ignorance. Now, that is voluntary of which the principle, or cause, is in the doer himself as thoroughly understanding all the circumstances because of which and under which the action was performed. *Circumstances* are what the grammarians call 'circumstantial parts of speech.' For example: we have *who*, or the person who acted; *whom*, or the person acted upon; *what*, or the very thing that was done, as, for example, murder; *with what*, or the instrument; *where*, or in what place; *when*, or at what time; *how*, or the manner of action; and *because of what*, or for what cause.

It should be borne in mind that there are some things which come between what is voluntary and what is involuntary

³ Cf. *ibid.* 31 (PG 40.724-725).

⁴ Cf. *ibid.* 32 (PG 40.728).

and which, although they may be unpleasant and painful, we permit in order to avoid a greater evil—as, for example, when we jettison a ship's cargo to avoid shipwreck.⁵

It should be borne in mind that, while children and brute beasts act voluntarily, they certainly do not do so through deliberate choice, and that all that we do in anger without previous consideration we do voluntarily, but certainly not through deliberate choice. Likewise, when a friend drops in on us unexpectedly, we accept his visit voluntarily but certainly not through deliberate choice. In the same way, one who has unexpectedly happened upon a treasure has indeed happened upon it willingly, but certainly not through deliberate choice. All these things are indeed voluntary because of the pleasure connected with them, but certainly not because of their having been chosen deliberately, since they did not happen as a result of deliberation. Choice must definitely be preceded by deliberation, as has been said.

Chapter 25

In treating of *free will*,¹ that is to say, of what depends upon us, the first consideration is as to whether there is anything that does depend upon us, because there are a number of people who deny it. A second consideration is as to what things depend upon us and over what things we do have control. A third consideration is how to explain the reason for which the God who made us made us free. And so, let us take up the first question and at the very outset prove from things accepted as true by our adversaries that there are some things that depend upon us. And let us proceed as follows.

They say that everything that happens is caused either by

5 Cf. *ibid.* 30 (PG 40.720B).

1 Cf. *ibid.* 39 (PG 40.761ff.).

God, or necessity, or fate, or nature, or chance, or spontaneity. But essence and providence are the work of God, while the movement of things which are always the same belongs to necessity. And to fate belongs the necessary fulfillment of what it has decreed, for fate also implies necessity. Generation, growth, corruption, plants, and animals belong to nature. The unusual and unexpected belong to chance. For chance is defined as the accidental concurrence of two causes originating in deliberate choice but resulting in something other than was intended, as in the case of someone digging a grave and finding a treasure. In this case, the one who put the treasure there did not do so in order that it might be found by another, and neither did the one who found it dig for the purpose of finding a treasure. On the contrary, the first put it there in order that he might get it whenever he should so choose, whereas the second dug in order to make a grave; but something else resulted, quite different from what was intended by either. Finally, to spontaneity belongs what befalls inanimate things or brute beasts without the intervention of nature or art. All this they themselves maintain. Now, if man is not an effective principle of action, to which of these causes are we to attribute human actions? It is definitely wrong ever to ascribe immoral and unjust actions to God; neither can they be ascribed to necessity, for they are not the actions of things which are always the same; nor can they be ascribed to fate, for they declare that the things decreed by fate are not contingent but necessary; nor to nature, for the works of nature are animals and plants; nor to chance, for human actions are not unusual and unexpected; nor yet to spontaneity, for they say that that is spontaneous which befalls inanimate things or brute beasts. Indeed, nothing remains but the fact that man himself as acting and doing is the principle of his own works and is free.

What is more, if man is not a principle of action, then his power of deliberation is superfluous, for to what use would he put his deliberation if he were not master of any action

at all? All deliberation is on account of action, and it would furthermore be absurd were the most excellent and noble of the faculties in man to prove useless. Besides, when a man deliberates, he does so on account of action, because all deliberation is on account of and for the sake of action.

Chapter 26

Some *things done*¹ depend upon us, while others do not. Those things depend upon us which we are free either to do or not to do, that is to say, everything which we do voluntarily—for a thing would not be said to be done voluntarily if the action did not depend upon us. To put it simply: those things depend upon us which incur blame or praise and in respect to which one may be urged or bound by law. Properly speaking, all those things depend upon us which pertain to the soul and about which we deliberate. And it is about contingents that deliberation is exercised. A *contingent* is that which we can do itself, and of which we can also do the opposite. Our mind makes this choice of itself, and this is the beginning of action. Those things, then, depend upon us which are contingent—as, for example, to move or not to move, to start or not to start, to desire things that are not absolutely necessary or not to desire them, to lie or not to lie, to give or not to give, to rejoice when one should and, similarly, not to when one should not, and all such things as imply virtue or vice—for in these things we are free. The arts also belong to the number of the contingents, because it is in our power to cultivate them, if we so wish, or not to cultivate them.

One should note that the choice of things to be done always rests with us, but that their doing is oftentimes prevented by some disposition of Divine Providence.²

1 Cf. *ibid.* 40 (PG 40.765ff.).

2 Cf. *ibid.* 37 (PG 40.749ff.).

Chapter 27

We maintain, then, that the freedom of the will is directly connected with the reason.¹ We also maintain that transformation and change are inherent in created beings. For everything that is created is also changeable, because whatever has originated in a change must needs be subject to change. Being brought from non-being to being is change, and so is being made into something else from an existing material. Now, inanimate things and brute beasts are changed by the corporeal alterations which have already been spoken of, whereas rational beings are changed by deliberate choice. This last is because of the fact that to the reason belong both the contemplative and active faculties. The contemplative faculty is that which examines the state of things, whereas the active faculty is the power of deliberation which applies right reason to such things as may be done. The contemplative faculty is also called *mind*, and the active faculty *reason*. Still again, the contemplative faculty is called *wisdom*, and the active faculty *prudence*. Thus, everyone who deliberates, as having in himself the power to choose such things as may be done, deliberates so that he may choose what has been selected through deliberation, and so that, having chosen it, he may act. But, if this is so, then freedom of will is necessarily connected by nature with the reason. Thus, a being may be irrational or rational; but, if it is rational, it will be the master of its actions and free. Whence it follows that the irrational beings are not free, since, instead of leading nature, they are led by it. And so it is that they do not deny their natural appetite, but, just as soon as they feel an appetite for something, they move to act. Man, however, since he is rational, leads his nature rather than is led by it. And so, when he feels an appetite, he has the power to resist it, should he so wish, or to obey it. This is why irrational beings are neither

¹ Cf. *ibid.* 41 (PG 40.773ff.).

to be praised nor blamed, while man is to be praised or blamed.

One should note that, since the angels are rational, they are free, and that, since they are created, they are subject to change. And a proof of this is the Devil, who, although he had been created good by the Creator, of his own free will became the discoverer of evil; and so also are the powers that rebelled with him, that is to say, the evil spirits, while the rest of the angelic orders persevered in the good.

Chapter 28

Some of those things which do not depend upon us have their origin, or cause, in things which do depend upon us. Such are the recompenses for our deeds, which we receive both in the present world and in that to come. All the rest, however, depend upon the divine will. The creation of all things is due to God, but corruption came in afterwards due to our own wickedness and as a punishment and a help. 'For God made not death: neither hath he pleasure in the destruction of the living';¹ rather, it was through man, that is to say, Adam's transgression, that death came with the other punishments. All the rest, however, are to be attributed to God. Thus, our creation is due to His creative power, our permanence to His providential power, and to His goodness the eternal enjoyment of the good things reserved for them that keep the law of nature—for which reason we were made. However, since there are some who deny His providence, let us go on to say a few things about providence.

¹ Wisd. 1.13.

Chapter 29

Providence, then, is the solicitude which God has for existing things. And again, providence is that will of God by which all existing things receive suitable guidance through to their end.¹ But, if providence is God's will, then, according to right reason, everything that has come about through providence has quite necessarily come about in the best manner and that most befitting God, so that it could not have happened in a better way. Now, the Maker of existing things must be the same as their Provider, for it is neither fitting nor logical that one should be their creator and another their provider, because in such a case they would both be definitely wanting—the one in the matter of creating and the other in that of providing.² Hence, God is both Creator and Provider, and is power of creating, sustaining, and providing is His good will. For 'whatsoever the Lord pleased he hath done, in heaven, and in earth,'³ and none resisted His will.⁴ He willed all things to be made and they were made; He wills the world to endure and it does endure; and all things whatsoever He wills are done.

Moreover, that He provides and provides well anyone might most correctly learn from the following consideration. God alone is by nature good and wise. Consequently, in so far as He is good He provides, because one who does not provide is not good. Even men and brute beasts naturally provide for their own offspring, and the one that does not will incur blame. Then, in so far as He is wise He provides for existing things in the very best way.⁵

And so, bearing these things in mind we should admire, praise, and unconditionally accept all the works of providence. And should these appear to a number of people to be unjust,

1 Cf. Nemesius, *op. cit.* 43 (PG 40.792-793).

2 Cf. *ibid.* 42 (PG 40.788-789).

3 Ps. 134.6.

4 Cf. Rom. 9.19.

5 Cf. Nemesius, *op. cit.* 44 (PG 40.813).

it is because of the fact that God's providence is beyond knowledge and beyond comprehension, and because to Him alone are our thoughts and actions and the events of the future known. However, when I say 'all,' I am referring to those things which do not depend upon us, because those which do depend upon us do not belong to providence, but to our own free will.

Some of the things that are due to providence are by approval, whereas others are by permission. All those that are undeniably good are by approval, whereas of those that are by permission [there are many kinds].⁶ Thus, He often permits even the just man to meet with misfortunes so that the virtue hidden in him may be made known to others, as in the case of Job.⁷ At other times, He permits something iniquitous to be done so that through this apparently iniquitous action some great and excellent thing may be brought about, as was the salvation of men by the Cross. In still another way, He permits the devout man to suffer evil either so that he may not depart from his right conscience or so that he may not fall into presumption from the strength and grace that have been given him, as in the case of Paul.⁸

Someone may be abandoned for a while for the correction of others so that by observing his state they may be instructed, as in the case of Lazarus and the rich man.⁹ For we are naturally humbled when we see the sufferings of others. Someone may also be abandoned not because of his own sins or his parents' but for the glory of another, as was the man born blind for the glory of the Son of Man.¹⁰ Again, someone may be permitted to suffer as an object of emulation for others so that because of the greatness of the glory of the one that suffered they may without hesitation accept suffering in hope of future glory and with a desire for the good things

6 Supplied from *ibid.* (PG 40.812A).

7 Cf. Job. 1.12; cf. Nemesius, *loc. cit.*

8 Cf. 2 Cor. 12.7.

9 Cf. Luke 16.19ff.; Nemesius, *loc. cit.*

10 Cf. John 9.3; Nemesius, *loc. cit.*

to come, as in the case of the martyrs. A person may even be allowed at times to fall into a immoral action for the correction of another and worse affliction. For example, a certain person is conceited about his virtues and righteousness, and God permits him to fall into fornication so that by his fall he may become conscious of his own weakness, be humbled, and, drawing nigh, confess to the Lord.

One should, moreover, note that, while the choice of things that may be done rests with us, the accomplishment of the good ones is due to the co-operation of God, who in accordance with His foreknowledge justly co-operates with those who in right conscience choose the good. The accomplishment of the bad things, however, is due to abandonment by God, who, again in accordance with His foreknowledge, justly abandons us.

Now, there are two kinds of abandonment, for there is one by dispensation which is for our instruction and there is another which is absolute rejection. That abandonment is by dispensation and for our instruction which happens for the correction, salvation, and glory of the one who experiences it, or which happens either to give others an object for emulation and imitation, or even for the glory of God. On the other hand, there is absolute abandonment, when God has done everything for a man's salvation, yet the man of his own accord remains obdurate and uncured, or rather, incorrigible, and is then given over to absolute perdition, like Judas. May God spare and deliver us from this sort of abandonment.

One should furthermore bear in mind that the ways of God's providence are many, and that they can neither be explained in words nor grasped by the mind.

One must note that for those who accept them with thanksgiving the attacks of adversity redound to salvation and definitely become instruments of aid.

One should also bear in mind that God antecedently wills all to be saved and to attain to His kingdom.¹¹ For He did

11 Cf. 1 Tim. 2.4.

not form us to be chastised, but, because He is good, that we might share in His goodness. Yet, because He is just, He does wish to punish sinners. So, the first is called *antecedent will* and *approval*, and it has Him as its cause; the second is called *consequent will* and *permission*, and it has ourselves as its cause. This last is twofold: that which is by dispensation and for our instruction and salvation, and that which is abandonment to absolute chastisement, as we have said. These, however, belong to those things which do not depend upon us.

As to the things which do depend upon us, the good ones He wills antecedently and approves, whereas the evil, which are essentially bad, He neither wills antecedently nor consequently, but permits them to the free will. Now, that which is done under compulsion is not rational; neither can it be a virtuous act. God provides for all creation, and through all creation He does good and instructs, oftentimes using even the demons themselves for this purpose, as in the case of Job and in that of the swine.¹²

Chapter 30

One should note that God foreknows all things but that He does not predestine them all.¹ Thus, He foreknows the things that depend upon us, but He does not predestine them—because neither does He will evil to be done nor does He force virtue. And so, predestination is the result of the divine command made with foreknowledge. Those things which do not depend upon us, however, He predestines in accordance with His foreknowledge.² For, through His fore-

¹² Cf. Job 1.12; Mark 5.13.

¹ Cf. John Chrysostom, *Homily 1 on the Obscurity of the Prophecies* 4 (PG 56.171).

² Cf. *Acts of St. Maximus* (PG 90.137).

knowledge, He has already decided all things beforehand in accordance with His goodness and justice.

One should furthermore note that our nature has been endowed by God with virtue, and that He is the source and author of all good, without whose co-operation and assistance we are powerless either to will good or to do it. Moreover, it depends upon ourselves whether we are to persevere in virtue and be guided by God who invites us to practice it; or whether we are to abandon virtue, which is to become attached to vice and be guided by the Devil, who, without forcing us, is inviting us to practice vice. For evil is nothing else but the absence of good, precisely as darkness is the absence of light. Consequently, when we persevere in what is according to nature, we are in a state of virtue; but, when we abandon what is according to nature, that is to say, virtue, we come to what is contrary to nature and become attached to vice.

Repentance is a return through discipline and toil from that which is against nature to that which is according to it, from the Devil to God.

Now, the Creator fashioned this man as a male and imparted His own divine grace to him, thus putting him in communion with Himself. And thus it was that man, like a prophet and lord, gave names to the animals which had been given him as slaves. For, since he had been made in the image of God rational, understanding, and free, it was reasonable that he should be entrusted by the common Creator and Lord of all with the government over the things on earth.

However, since God knew the future and foresaw that man was to fall and be subject to death, He made from him a female as a helpmate for him of his own kind to aid him in the establishment of the race after the fall by succession through the process of begetting. Now, the first forming is called 'creation,' not 'begetting.' Creation is the first forming by God, whereas begetting is the succession of one from

another made necessary by the sentence of death resulting from the fall.

This man He set in the paradise which was both of the mind and of the senses. Thus, while in his body he lived on earth in the world of sense, in his spirit he dwelt among the angels, cultivating thoughts of God and being nurtured on these. He was naked because of his innocence and his simplicity of life, and through creatures he was drawn up to their only Creator, in whose contemplation he rejoiced and took delight.

Since God had endowed man's nature with a free will, He made it a law for him not to taste of that tree of knowledge of which we have spoken sufficiently and to the best of our ability in the chapter on paradise. This command He gave to man with the promise that should he let reason prevail, recognizing his Creator and observing his Creator's ordinance, and thus preserve the dignity of his soul, then he would become stronger than death and would live forever in the enjoyment of everlasting bliss. On the other hand, should he shake off the yoke of his Maker and disregard His divine ordinance, thus subordinating soul to body and preferring the pleasures of the flesh, 'not understanding his own honor and compared to senseless beasts,'³ then he would be subject to death and corruption and would be obliged to drag out his miserable existence in toil. For it was not profitable for him to attain incorruptibility while yet untried and untested, 'lest he fall into pride and the judgment of the devil.'⁴ For it was by reason of his incorruptibility that, after his fall by deliberate choice, the Devil became unrepentingly and immoveably rooted in evil. In the same way again, after their deliberate election of virtue, the angels were immutably founded in good by grace.

And so it was necessary first for man to be tested, since one who is untried and untested deserves no credit.⁵ Then,

³ Ps. 48.13.

⁴ 1 Tim. 3.6.

⁵ Cf. Eccli. 34.11.

when trial had made him perfect through his keeping of the commandment, he should thus win incorruptibility, the reward of virtue. For, since he had been created half way between God and matter, should he be freed from his natural relationship to creatures and united to God by keeping the commandment, then he was to be permanently united to God and immutably rooted in good. Should he, on the other hand through his disobedience turn his mind away from his Author—I mean God—and tend rather toward matter, then he was to be associated with corruption, to become passible rather than impassible, and mortal rather than immortal. He was to stand in need of carnal copulation and seminal generation, and because of his attachment to life was not only to cling to these pleasures as if they were necessary to sustain this life, but also to hate without limit such as would think of depriving him of them. And while he was to transfer his attachment from God to matter, he was also to transfer his anger from the real enemy of his salvation to his own kind. And so it was that man was overcome by the envy of the Devil. For that envious and hateful demon, having himself been brought low by his conceit, would not suffer us to attain the higher things. So the liar tempted that wretched man with the very hope of divinity, and, having raised him up to his own heights of conceit, dragged him down to the same abyss of ruin.

BOOK THREE

Chapter 1



AND SO, MAN SUCCUMBED to the assault of the demon, the author of evil; he failed to keep the Creator's commandment and was stripped of grace and deprived of that familiarity which he had enjoyed with God; he was clothed with the roughness of his wretched life—for this is what the fig leaves signify—and put on death, that is to say, the mortality and grossness of the flesh—for this is what the garment of skins signifies;¹ he was excluded from paradise by the just judgment of God; and was condemned to death and made subject to corruption. Even then the Compassionate One, who had given him his being and had favored him with a blessed existence, did not disregard him. On the contrary, He first schooled him and exhorted him to conversion in many ways—by groaning and trembling, by a flood of waters and the near destruction of the entire race, by the confusion and division of tongues, by the tutelage of angels, by the destruction of cities by fire, by prefigurative divine appearances, by war, victories and defeats, by signs and portents, by diverse influences, by the Law and the Prophets², all of which were directed to the destruction of that sin which had abounded under many forms and had enslaved man and heaped every sort of evil into his life,

¹ Cf. Gen. 3.7.21.

² Cf. Gen. 6.13; 11.7; 18.1ff; 19.1ff; cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 38.13 (PG 36.325A).

and to his return to the blessed existence. Since it was by sin that death had come into the world like some wild and savage beast to destroy the life of man, it was necessary for the one who was to effect a redemption to be sinless and not liable to the death which is due to sin. And it was further necessary for human nature to be strengthened and renewed, to be taught by experience, and to learn the way of virtue which turns back from destruction and leads to eternal life. Finally, the great sea of His benevolence toward man was made manifest, for the Creator and Lord Himself took up the struggle in behalf of His own creation and became a teacher in deed. And, since the enemy had caught man with the bait of the hope of divinity, he himself was taken with the bait of the barrier of the flesh; and at the same time the goodness and wisdom and justice and power of God were made manifest. His goodness, because He did not despise the weakness of His own handiwork, but, when he fell, had compassion on him and stretched out His hand to him. His justice, because, when man had suffered defeat, He did not have another conquer the tyrant nor did He snatch man away from death by force, but He, the Good and Just, made him victor against whom death had once enslaved through sin; and like He rescued by like, which was most difficult to do. And His wisdom, because He found the most fitting solution for this most difficult problem.³ For by the good pleasure of God the Father the only-begotten Son and Word of God and God, who is in the bosom of God the Father, consubstantial with the Father and with the Holy Ghost, existing before the ages, without beginning, who was in the beginning and was with God the Father and was God,⁴ He, being in the form of God,⁵ bowed down the heavens and descended—that is, without lowering it, He brought down His exalted sublimity and condescended

³ Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *Catechetical Discourse* 24 (PG 45.65).

⁴ Cf. John 1.1, 18.

⁵ Cf. Phil. 2.6.

to His servants with an ineffable and incomprehensible condescension, for such is the meaning of the term condescension. And He, while being perfect God, became perfect man and accomplished the newest of all new things, the only new thing under the sun, by which the infinite power of God was clearly shown. For what is greater than for God to become man? So, without suffering change, the Word was made flesh of the Holy Ghost and the holy and ever-virgin Mary, Mother of God. And He stands as mediator between God and men. He, the only loving One, was conceived in the immaculate womb of the Virgin not by the will of man, nor by concupiscence, nor by the intervention of a husband, nor by pleasurable generation, but of the Holy Ghost and the first offspring of Adam. And He became obedient to the Father by healing our disobedience with that which is like to us and which was taken from us, and by becoming to us a model of that obedience without which it is impossible to attain salvation.

Chapter 2

Now, an angel of the Lord was sent to the holy Virgin, who was descended from the tribe of David, 'for it is evident that our Lord sprung out of Juda: of which tribe no one attended on the altar,'¹ as the divine Apostle said and concerning which we shall speak more fully later on. Bringing the good tidings to her, he said: 'Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee.' And she was troubled at his saying, and the angel said to her: 'Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found grace with God, and thou shalt bring forth a son and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins.' It is for this reason that the name Jesus is interpreted as meaning saviour. And she was troubled and said: 'How shall this be done to me, because I know

¹ Heb. 7.13,14.

not man?" Again the angel spoke to her: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee. And therefore also the Holy which shall be born to thee shall be called the Son of God." Then she said to him: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord: be it done to me according to thy word."²

And so, after the holy Virgin had given her assent, the Holy Ghost came upon her according to the Lord's word, which the angel had spoken, and purified her and gave her the power both to receive the divinity of the Word and to beget.³ Then the subsistent Wisdom and Power of the Most High, the Son of God, the Consubstantial with the Father, overshadowed her like a divine seed and from her most chaste and pure blood compacted for Himself a body animated by a rational and intellectual soul as first-fruits of our clay. This was not by seed, but by creation through the Holy Ghost, with the form not being put together bit by bit, but being completed all at once with the Word of God Himself serving as the person to the flesh. For the divine Word was not united to an already self-subsistent flesh,⁴ but, without being circumscribed, came in His own person to dwell in the womb of the holy Virgin and from the chaste blood of the ever-virgin made flesh subsist animated by a rational and intellectual soul. Taking to Himself the first-fruits of the human clay, the very Word became person to the body. Thus, there was a body which was at once the body of God the Word and an animate, rational, intellectual body. Therefore, we do not say that man became God, but that God became man. For, while He was by nature perfect God, the same became by nature perfect man. He did not change His nature and neither did He just appear to become man. On the contrary, without confusion or alteration or division He became hypostatically united to the rationally and intel-

² Luke 1.28-38.

³ Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 38.13 (PG 36.325B).

⁴ Cf. Proclus of Constantinople, *Epistle* 2.5 (PG 65.860-861).

lectually animated flesh which He had from the holy Virgin and which had its existence in Him. He did not transform the nature of his divinity into the substance of His flesh, nor the substance of His flesh into the nature of His divinity, and neither did He effect one compound nature out of His divine nature and the human nature which He had assumed.

Chapter 3

The natures were united to each other without change and without alteration. The divine nature did not give up its proper simplicity, and the human nature was certainly not changed into the nature of the divinity, nor did it become non-existent. Neither was there one compound nature made from the two natures. For the compounded nature can in no wise be consubstantial with either one of the natures from which it has been compounded, since from diverse natures it has been made into something else. For example, the body, which is made up of the four elements, is not said to be consubstantial with fire, nor is it called fire, nor is it called water or earth or air either, nor is it consubstantial with any one of these. Accordingly, if Christ had one compound nature after the union,¹ having changed from one simple nature to a compound one, as the heretics say, then He is neither consubstantial with His Father, who has a simple nature, nor with His Mother, because she was not composed of divinity and humanity. Nor, indeed, will He belong to divinity or humanity, nor can He be called God or man, but just Christ alone, and, according to them, 'Christ' will not be the name of the person but the name of the one nature. We, however, declare that Christ has a compound nature, not in the sense of something new made from different things, as man is made up of body and soul or as the body

¹ Cf. Maximus, *Epistle 12* (PG 91.488-489); Leontius, *Against the Arguments of Severus* (PG 86.1928A).

is composed of the four elements, but in the sense of being made up of different things which remain the same. For we confess that from divinity and humanity there is the same perfect God and that He both is and is said to be of two natures and in two natures. We say that the term 'Christ' is the name of the person and that it is not used in a restricted sense, but as signifying what is of the two natures. Thus, He anointed Himself—as God, anointing His body with His divinity, but as man, being anointed, because He is both the one and the other. Moreover, the anointing of the humanity is the divinity. Now, if Christ, who is consubstantial with the Father, has one compounded nature, then the Father, too, will certainly be compounded and consequently consubstantial with the flesh, which is absurd and redolent of every blasphemy.

What is more, how can one nature comprise different substances that are contradictory? How is it possible for the same nature to be at once created and uncreated, mortal and immortal, circumscribed and uncircumscribed?

Now, were they to say that Christ had one nature and that this was simple, then either they would be confessing Him to be pure God and would be introducing a mere appearance that would not be incarnation, or they would be confessing Him to be mere man after the manner of Nestorius. Then, where is the perfection in divinity and the perfection in humanity? How can they ever say that Christ has two natures, while they are asserting that after the union He has one compound nature? For it is obvious to anyone that, before the union, Christ had one nature.

However, the reason for the heretics' error is their saying that nature and hypostasis are the same thing.² Now, when we say that men have one nature, it must be understood that we do not say this with the body and soul in mind, because it is impossible to say that the soul and the body as compared to each other have one nature. Nevertheless,

2 Cf. Anastasius Sinaite, *The Guide* 9 (PG 89.140ff.).

when we take a number of human hypostases, all of these are found to admit of the same basis of their nature. All are made up of a soul and a body, all share the nature of the soul and possess the substance of the body, and all have a common species. Thus, we say that several different persons have one nature, because each person has two natures and is complete in these two natures, that is to say, the natures of the soul and of the body.

In the case of our Lord Jesus Christ, however, it is impossible to have a common species, for there never was, nor is, nor ever will be another Christ of divinity and humanity, in divinity and humanity, the same being perfect God and perfect man. Hence, in the case of our Lord Jesus Christ, one cannot speak of one nature made up of divinity and humanity as one can in the case of the individual made up of soul and body. In this last case we have an individual, but Christ is not an individual, because He does not have a predicated species of Christness. It is precisely for this reason that we say that it was of two perfect natures, the divine and the human, that the union was made. It was not made by mixing, or mingling, or blending, or compounding as was asserted by the fatal Dioscorus, by Eutyches, too, and Severus, and their accursed associates; neither was it apparent (προσωπική) nor relative, nor by dignity or harmony of will or equality in honor or identity of name or complaisance as was asserted by that enemy of God, Nestorius, and by Diodorus, too, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, and their hellish band. Rather, it was by composition—hypostatically, that is to say—without change or mingling or alteration or division or separation. And we confess one Person of the Son of God incarnate³ in two natures that remain perfect, and we declare that the Person of His divinity and of His humanity is the same and confess that the two natures are preserved intact in Him after the union. We do not set each nature apart by itself, but hold them to be united to each

3 Cf. Maximus, *Epistle 12* (PG 91.501BC).

other in one composite Person. For we say that the union is substantial; that is to say, true and not imaginary. We do not, however, define the substantial union as meaning that the two natures go to make up one compound nature, but as meaning that they are truly united to each other into one composite Person of the Son of God, each with its essential difference maintained intact. Thus, that which was created remained created, and that which was uncreated, uncreated; the mortal remained mortal and the immortal immortal; the circumscribed remained circumscribed and the uncircumscribed, uncircumscribed; the visible remained visible and the invisible, invisible. 'The one glows with miracles, while the other has succumbed to insults.'⁴

Moreover, the Word makes human things His own, because what is proper to His sacred flesh belongs to Him; and the things which are His own He communicates to His flesh. This is after the manner of exchange on account of the mutual immanence of the parts and the hypostatic union and because He who 'with each form co-operating with the other performed'⁵ both divine and human acts was one and the same. Wherefore, the Lord of Glory is even said to have been crucified,⁶ although His divine nature did not suffer; and the Son of Man is confessed to have been in heaven before His passion, as the Lord Himself has said.⁷ For one and the same was the Lord of Glory and He who was naturally and truly Son of Man, that is, He who became man. And we recognize both the miracles and the sufferings as His, even though it was in one nature that He worked miracles and in another that He endured suffering. For we know that His one Person thus preserves for itself the essential difference of the natures. How, indeed, would the difference be preserved, were not those things preserved

⁴ Leo, *Epistle* 28.4 (PL 54.768B).

⁵ *Ibid.* (PL 54.772A).

⁶ Cf. 1 Cor. 2.8.

⁷ Cf. John 3.13.

in which they differ from each other? For difference is that by which things that are different differ. Therefore, we say that Christ is joined to the extremes by the fact of His natures differing from each other, that is, by the fact of His essence. On the one hand, He is joined to the Father and the Spirit by His divinity, while on the other He is joined by His humanity to His Mother and to all men. However, because of the fact that His natures are united, we say that He differs both from the Father and the Spirit and from His Mother and other men. For His natures are united in His Person and have one composite Person, and in this He differs both from the Father and the Spirit and from His Mother and us.

Chapter 4

We have repeatedly said that *substance* is one thing and *person* another, and that *substance* means the common species including the persons that belong to the same species—as, for example, God, man—while *person* indicates an individual, as Father, Son, Holy Ghost, Peter, Paul. One must furthermore know that the terms *divinity* and *humanity* are indicative of the substances or natures, but that the terms *God* and *man* are used in reference to the nature, as when we say: ‘God is an incomprehensible substance’ and ‘God is one.’ But these are also taken as referring to the persons, with the more particular receiving the name of the more general, as when Scripture says: ‘Therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee,’¹ for in this case it means the Father and the Son. And again, when it says: ‘There was a man in the land of Hus,’² for it means Job only.

Since, then, in our Lord Jesus Christ we recognize two natures and one composite Person for both, when we are considering the natures, we call them divinity and humanity.

¹ Ps. 44.8.

² Job 1.1.

But, when we consider the composite Person of the two natures, we sometimes call Christ both God and Man and God incarnate, naming Him from both; and sometimes we name Him from one of the two and call Him just God and Son of God, or just Man and Son of Man. And also, we sometimes name Him from just the sublime attributes and sometimes from just the more humble ones. For He is one who is alike both the one and the other—the one existing uncaused and eternally from the Father; the other come into being at a later time because of love for men.³

Therefore, when we speak of the divinity, we do not attribute the properties of the humanity to it. Thus, we never speak of a passible or created divinity. Neither do we predicate the divine properties of the flesh, for we never speak of uncreated flesh or humanity. In the case of the person, however, whether we name it from both of the parts or from one of them, we attribute the properties of both the natures to it. And thus, Christ—which name covers both together—is called both God and man, created and uncreated, passible and impassible. And whenever He is named Son of God and God from one of the parts, He receives the properties of the co-existent nature, of the flesh, that is to say, and can be called passible God and crucified Lord of Glory⁴—not as being God, but in so far as the same one is also man. When, again, He is named Man and the Son of Man, He is given the properties and splendors of the divine nature. He is called Child before the Ages and Man without beginning, not as a child or a man, but as God, who is before the ages and became a child in latter times. Such, then, is the manner of this exchange by which each nature communicates its own properties to the other through the identity of their person and their mutual immanence. This is how we can say of Christ: 'This is our God, who was seen upon earth

³ Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 29.19 (PG 36.100A).

⁴ Cf. 1 Cor. 2.8.

and conversed with men,'⁵ and: 'This man is uncreated, impassible, and uncircumscribed.'

Chapter 5

In the Divinity we confess one nature, while we hold three really existing Persons.¹ And we hold everything belonging to the nature and the essence to be simple, while we recognize the difference of the Persons as residing only in the three properties of being uncaused and Father, of being caused and Son, and of being caused and proceeding. And we understand them to be inseparable and without interval between them, and united to one another and mutually immanent without confusion. And we understand them, while being separated without interval, to be united without confusion, for they are three, even though they are united. For, although each is subsistent in itself, that is to say, is a perfect Person and has its own property or distinct manner of existence, they are united in their essence and natural properties and by their not being separated or removed from the Person of the Father, and they are one God and are so called. In the same way, when it comes to that divine and ineffable Incarnation of one of the Holy Trinity, God the Word and our Lord Jesus Christ, which surpasses all understanding and comprehension, while we confess two natures, a divine and a human, conjoined with each other and hypostatically united, we also confess one composite Person made of those natures. We furthermore hold that, even after the union, the two natures are preserved intact in the one composite person, that is to say, in the one Christ, and that they and their natural properties have real existence, being nevertheless united without con-

⁵ Bar. 3.36,38.

¹ Cf. Leontius, *Against the Arguments of Severus* (PG 86.1920-1921).

fusion, differing without separation, and numbered. Now, just as the three Persons of the Holy Trinity are united without confusion and are distinct without separation and have number without the number causing division, or separation, or estrangement, or severance among them—for we recognize that the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost are one God—so in the same way the natures of Christ, although united, are united without confusion, and, although mutually immanent, do not suffer any change or transformation of one into the other. For each one keeps its own distinctiveness unchanged. Thus, too, they are numbered, yet the number does not introduce division. For Christ is one and He is perfect both in divinity and humanity. And number is not by nature a cause of division or union, but is, rather, a sign of the quantity of the things numbered, whether they be united or divided. Thus, as an example of things that are united, this wall contains fifty stones; or, as an example of things that are divided, there are fifty stones lying in this field. Or again, as an example of things that are united, there are two natures in a coal—that of fire, I mean, and that of wood; or these may be divided, because the nature of fire is one thing and that of wood another. And these are not united or divided by their number but in some other manner. And so, just as it is impossible to say that the three Persons are one Person, even though they are united, without bringing about confusion or suppression of the difference, so it is impossible to say that the two hypostatically united natures of Christ are one nature without our bringing about suppression, confusion, or annihilation of their difference.

Chapter 6

Things that are common and universal are predicated of particulars subordinate to them. Now, the substance as a species is a common thing, while the person is a particular.

A thing is a particular not in that it possesses a part of the nature, because it does not have such a part, but in that it is particular in number, as an individual. Thus, persons are said to differ in number but not in nature. The substance, moreover, is predicated of the person, because the substance is complete in each of the persons of the same species. For that reason, persons do not differ from one another in substance, but rather in the accidents, which are their characteristic properties—characteristic, however, of the person and not of the nature. And this is because the person is defined as a substance plus accidents. Thus, the person has that which is common plus that which is individuating, and, besides this, existence in itself. Substance does not subsist in itself, but is to be found in persons. Accordingly, when one of the persons suffers, then, since the whole nature in which the person has suffered is affected, this whole nature is said to have suffered in one of its persons. This, however, does not necessitate all the persons of the same species suffering together with the one that does suffer.

Thus, then, we confess that the nature of the divinity is entirely and completely in each one of its Persons—all in the Father, all in the Son, all in the Holy Ghost. For this reason, the Father is perfect God, the Son is perfect God, and the Holy Ghost is perfect God. In the same way, we say that in the Incarnation of one of the Holy Trinity, the Word of God, the entire and complete nature of the divinity was united in one of its Persons to the entire human nature, and not a part of one to a part of the other. And so the divine Apostle says that 'in Him dwelleth the fullness of the Godhead corporeally,'¹ that is to say, in His flesh. And his inspired disciple Dionysius, who was most learned in matters divine, says that the Divinity in its entirety has community with us in one of its Persons.² But, certainly, let us not be constrained to say that all the Persons of the sacred Godhead,

1 Col. 2.9.

2 Cf. Pseudo-Dionysius, *Divine Names* 2.6 (PG 3.644BD).

the Three, that is, were hypostatically united to all the persons of humanity. For in no wise did the Father and the Holy Ghost participate in the incarnation of the Word of God except by Their good pleasure and will. We do say that the entire substance of the Divinity was united to the entire human nature, because God the Word lacked none of those things which He implanted in our nature when He formed us in the beginning; He assumed them all—a body and a rational, intellectual soul, together with the properties of both, for the animal which lacks one of these is not a man. He in His entirety assumed me in my entirety and was wholly united to the whole, so that He might bestow the grace of salvation upon the whole. For that which has not been assumed cannot be healed.³

And so, the Word of God is united to the flesh by the intermediary of mind which stands midway between the purity of God and the grossness of the flesh.⁴ Now, the mind has authority over both soul and body, but, whereas mind is the purest part of the soul, God is the purest part of mind. And when the mind of Christ is permitted by the stronger, then it displays its own authority. However, it is under the control of the stronger and follows it, doing those things which the divine will desires.

Moreover, the mind became the seat of the Divinity which had been hypostatically united to it, just as, of course, the flesh did—but not an associate, as the accursed opinion of the heretics falsely teaches, when, judging immaterial things in a material way, they say that one measure will not hold two. But, how shall Christ have been said to be perfect God and perfect man and consubstantial both with the Father and with us, if a part of the divine nature is united in Him to a part of the human nature?

Furthermore, when we say that our nature rose from the

³ Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Epistle* 101 (PG 37.181C).

⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, *Sermon* 38.10 (PG 36.321AC).

dead and ascended and sat at the right hand of the Father, we do not imply that all human persons arose and sat at the right hand of the Father, but that our entire nature did so in the Person of Christ. Certainly, the divine Apostle says: 'He hath raised us up together and hath made us sit together in Christ.'⁵

And we also say this: that the union was made of common substances. For every substance is common to the persons included under it. And it is not possible to find a partial and individuating nature of substance, since it would then be necessary to say that the same persons were of the same substance and of different substances, and that the Holy Trinity was in its divinity both of the same substance and of different substances. Consequently, the same nature is found in each one of the Persons. And when, following the blessed Athanasius and Cyril, we say that the nature of the Word became incarnate, we are declaring that the Divinity was united to the flesh. For this reason, we may by no means say: 'The nature of the Word suffered,' because the Divinity did not suffer in Him. But we do say that human nature suffered in Christ without any implication that all human persons did; confessing that Christ suffered in His human nature. Thus, when we say 'the nature of the Word,' we mean the Word Himself. And the Word possesses the community of substance and the individuality of person.

Chapter 7

We say, then, that the divine Person of God the Word exists before all things timelessly and eternally, simple and uncompounded, uncreated, incorporeal, invisible, intangible, and uncircumscribed. And we say that it has all things that the Father has, since it is consubstantial with Him, and that it differs from the Person of the Father by the manner

⁵ Eph. 2.6.

of its begetting and by relation, that it is perfect and never leaves the Person of the Father. But, at the same time, we say that in latter times, without leaving the bosom of the Father, the Word came to dwell uncircumscribed in the womb of the holy Virgin, without seed and without being contained, but after a manner known to Him, and in the very same Person as exists before the ages He made flesh subsist for Himself from the holy Virgin.

Thus, He was in all things and above all things, and at the same time He was existing in the womb of the holy Mother of God, but He was there by the operation of the Incarnation. And so, He was made flesh and took from her the first-fruits of our clay, a body animated by a rational and intellectual soul, so that the very Person of God the Word was accounted to the flesh. And the Person of the Word which formerly had been simple was made composite.¹ Moreover, it was a composite from two perfect natures, divinity and humanity. And it had that characteristic and distinctive property of sonship by which God the Word is distinct from the Father and the Spirit, and also had those characteristic and distinctive properties of the flesh by which He is distinct both from His Mother and from the rest of men. It further had those properties of the divine nature in which He is one with the Father and the Spirit, and also had those features of human nature in which He is one with His Mother and with us. Moreover, He differs from the Father and the Spirit and from His Mother and us in yet another way, by His being at once both God and man. For this we recognize as a most peculiar property of the Person of Christ.

And so, we confess that even after the Incarnation He is the one Son of God, and we confess that the same is the

¹ σύνθετος ὑπόστασις, or compound hypostasis, an expression used by Leontius and meaning that the whole Christ is made up, as it were, of two parts or natures, is used in opposition to the Monophysite expression, 'one compound nature of Christ.'

Son of Man, one Christ, one Lord, the only-begotten Son and Word of God, Jesus our Lord. And we venerate His two begettings—one from the Father before the ages and surpassing cause and reason and time and nature, and one in latter times for our own sake, after our own manner, and surpassing us. For our own sake, because it was for the sake of our salvation; after our own manner, because He was made man from a woman and with a period of gestation; and surpassing us, because, surpassing the law of conception, He was not from seed but from the Holy Ghost and the holy Virgin Mary. And we do not proclaim Him God alone, stripped of our humanity, nor do we despoil Him of His divinity and proclaim Him man alone. Neither do we proclaim Him one and another; rather, we proclaim Him to be one and the same, at once both God and man, perfect God and perfect man, God entire and man entire—the same being God entire, even with His flesh, and man entire, even with His most sacred divinity. By saying ‘perfect God and perfect man’ we show the fullness and completeness of the natures, while by saying ‘God entire and man entire’ we point out the individuality and the indivisibility of the person.

Following the blessed Cyril,² we also confess one incarnate nature of the Word of God and by saying ‘incarnate’ intend the substance of the flesh. So, the Word was made flesh without giving up His own immateriality and He was wholly made flesh while remaining wholly uncircumscribed. With respect to His body He becomes small and contracted, while with respect divinity He is uncircumscribed, for His body is not co-extensive with His uncircumscribed divinity.

The whole He, then, is perfect God, but not wholly God, because He is not only God but also man. Likewise, the whole He is perfect man, but not wholly man, because He is not only man but also God. For the ‘wholly’ is indicative of nature, while the ‘whole’ is indicative of person, just as ‘one thing’ is of nature, while ‘another one’ is of person.

2 Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistle* 44 and 46 (PG 77.225B and 241B).

One must know, moreover, that, although we say that the natures of the Lord are mutually immanent, we know that this immanence comes from the divine nature. For this last pervades all things and indwells as it wishes, but nothing pervades it. And it communicates its own splendours to the body while remaining impassible and having no part in the affections of the body. For, if the sun communicates its own operations to us, yet has no part in our own, then how much more so the Creator of the sun who is the Lord?

Chapter 8

Should anyone inquire regarding the natures of the Lord as to whether they are reducible to a continuous quantity or to a divided one, we shall reply that the Lord's natures are neither one solid, nor one surface, nor one line, nor are they place or time, so as to be reducible to a continuous quantity—for these are the things which are accounted to be continuous.

It must be known, moreover, that number belongs to things which differ and that it is impossible for things to be numbered which do not differ at all. It is by that in which they differ that things are numbered. For example, in so far as Peter and Paul are one, they are not numbered. Thus, since they are one by reason of their substance, they cannot be called two natures. However, since they do differ in person, they are called two persons. Hence, things which differ have number, and it is according to the manner in which they differ that they are numbered.

Now, whereas the Lord's natures are hypostatically united without confusion, they are divided without separation by reason and way of their difference. In so far as they are one, they have no number, for we do not say that Christ has two natures according to person. They are numbered, however, by way of their being divided without separation. For

by reason and way of their difference the natures of Christ are two. Thus, being hypostatically one and mutually immanent, they are united without confusion with each one preserving its own natural difference. And so, since they are numbered by way of their difference only, it is in that way that they will be reducible to a divided quantity.

Christ, then, who is perfect God and perfect man, is one.¹ Him do we adore with the Father and the Spirit together with His immaculate body in one adoration. And we do not say that His body is not to be adored, because it is adored in the one Person of the Word who became Person to it. Yet we do not worship the creature, because we do not adore it as a mere body, but as being one with the divinity, because His two natures belong to the one Person and the one subsistence of the Word of God. I am afraid to touch the burning coal because of the fire which is combined with the wood. I adore the combined natures of Christ because of the divinity which is united to the body. Thus, I do not add a fourth person to the Trinity—God forbid!—but I do confess the Person of the Word of God and of His flesh to be one. For, even after the Incarnation of the Word, the Trinity remained Trinity.

*To those who inquire as to whether the two natures are reducible to a continuous or divided quantity.*²

The Lord's natures are neither one solid, nor one surface, nor one line, nor are they place or time, so as to be reducible to a continuous quantity—for these are the things which are accounted to be continuous. Moreover, the Lord's natures are hypostatically united without confusion and they are divided without separation by reason and way of their dif-

1 Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *Defense of the Anathemas against Theodoret* 8 (PG 76.429AB).

2 This is found in most manuscripts after Book 4.9, but it is more logically placed here by Lequien.

ference. In so far as they are one, they have no number. For we do not say that Christ's natures are two Persons or that they are two according to Person. They are numbered, however, by way of their being divided without separation. For there are two natures by reason and way of their difference. Thus, being hypostatically one and mutually immanent, they are united without any confusion or transformation of one into the other and with each preserving its own natural difference for itself. For the created remained created and the uncreated uncreated. And so, since they are numbered by way of their difference only, it is in that way that they will be reducible to a divided quantity. For it is impossible for things to be numbered which do not differ at all. It is by that in which they differ that things are numbered. For example, in so far as Peter and Paul are one, they are not numbered. Thus, since they are one by reason of their substance, they neither are two natures nor are they so called. However, since they do differ in person, they are called two persons. And so their difference is the cause of their number.

Chapter 9

Now, although there is no nature without subsistence (ἀνυπόστατος) or substance without person, because both the substance and the nature are only to be found in subsistences and persons, it is unnecessary for natures hypostatically united to each other to be provided each with its own subsistence. For they can concur in one subsistence without being non-subsistent, yet not having each its own individuating subsistence, but both having one and the same.¹ Thus, since the same Person of the Word belongs to both natures, it does not allow one of them to lack subsistences, nor is it now the Person of one and now that of the other. On the contrary, it is always indivisibly and inseparably

¹ Cf. Leontius, *On Sects* 7.2 (PG 86,1241BC).

Person of both, and is not distributed and divided by the allotment of one part of itself to the one nature and another part to the other, but belongs indivisibly and entirely all to one and all to the other. For the flesh of the Word of God was not independently subsistent nor was there any other person besides that of the Word of God. On the contrary, it was in the Person of the Word that the flesh subsisted, or, rather, had personality (ἐνυπόστατος), and it did not become an independently subsisting person in itself. For this reason, it neither lacks personality nor introduces another person into the Trinity.

Chapter 10

It follows from the preceding that we consider blasphemous the addition made to the Thrice-Holy Hymn¹ by that stupid Peter the Fuller, because it introduces a fourth person and makes the Son of God partly the subsistent power of the Father and partly the crucified One—as if this last were another than the Strong, or as if the Holy Trinity was held to be passible and the Father and the Holy Ghost to have been crucified along with the Son. Away with this blasphemous interpolated nonsense! We understand the ‘Holy God’ as referring to the Father, and yet we do not restrict the appellation of divinity to Him alone, but recognize the Son and the Holy Ghost to be God, also. The ‘Holy Strong’ we take as referring to the Son, yet we do not strip the Father and the Holy Ghost of their strength. And the ‘Holy Immortal’ we apply to the Holy Ghost without excluding the Father and the Son from immortality, but understanding all the divine attributes as referring to each of the Persons. In this we are faithfully imitating the Apostle when he says: ‘Yet to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we of him: and one Lord Jesus Christ, by

¹ For the *Trisagion Hymn* see the Introduction and J. Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church* (London 1865) 688-689.

whom are all things, and we by him: and one Holy Ghost, in whom are all things, and we in him,'² and in the same way Gregory the Theologian, who somewhere says: 'To us there is one God the Father, from whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and one Holy Ghost, in whom are all things.'³ And the 'from whom,' 'through whom,' and 'in whom' do not divide the natures, for in that case the prepositions and the order of the names would not be changeable. Rather, they designate the properties of one unconfused nature. This is also clear from the fact that they are found brought together into one again, when one reads with attention that passage from the same Apostle that runs: 'Of him, and by him, and in him are all things: to him be glory for ever. Amen.'⁴

Moreover, the divine and holy Athanasius,⁵ and Basil, Gregory, and the whole choir of inspired Fathers bear witness to the fact that the Thrice-Holy Hymn is not addressed to the Son alone, but to the Holy Trinity, saying that by the threefold sanctification the holy Seraphim are intimating to us the three Persons of the supersubstantial Godhead. And by the one dominion they are making known the one substance and kingdom of the divinely sovereign Trinity. Certainly, Gregory the Theologian says: 'Thus, then, the Holy of Holies, which is veiled by the Seraphim, is glorified with three sanctifications converging into one dominion and Godhead, which has also been most beautifully and sublimely discussed by a certain other of our predecessors.'⁶

Now, those who have compiled the history of the Church⁷ relate how once, when Proculus was archbishop, the people of Constantinople were making public entreaty to avert some threat of the divine wrath, and it happened that a child was

2 1 Cor. 8.6.

3 Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 39.12 (PG 36.348A).

4 Rom. 11.36.

5 Cf. Athanasius, *On the Text of Matthew* 11.27 6 (PG 25.217C-220A).

6 Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 38.8 (PG 36.320BC).

7 Cf. Theophanes, *Chronography*, a.m. 5930 (PG 108.244ff.).

taken up out of the crowd and by some angelic choirmasters was taught the Thrice-Holy Hymn after the following fashion: 'Holy God, Holy Strong, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us.' When the child came back again and told what he had been taught, the whole crowd sang the hymn and the threat was averted. And it is traditional that the Thrice-Holy Hymn was also sung in this manner at the holy and great Fourth Ecumenical Council—that which was held in Chalcedon, I mean—for so it is reported in the acts of this same holy council.⁸ So it is really a silly and childish thing for the Thrice-Holy Song, which was taught by the angels, confirmed by the averting of the disaster, ratified and guaranteed by the council of so many holy Fathers, and sung first of all by the Seraphim to express the Godhead in three Persons, to have been trampled upon, as it were, and supposedly corrected by the absurd conceit of the Fuller—as if he were greater than the Seraphim. Oh, what presumption—not to call it madness! However, though the demons may burst, we, too, will say in this way: 'Holy God, Holy Strong, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us.'

Chapter 11

The nature may either be taken purely theoretically, since it is not self-subsistent; or it may be taken as what is common to persons of the same species and connects them, in which case it is said to be a nature taken specifically; or the same, with accidents added, may be considered wholly in one person, in which case it is said to be a nature taken individually, which is the same as that taken specifically. Now, when God the Word became incarnate, He did not assume His human nature as taken in a purely theoretical sense—for that would have been no real incarnation, but a fraudulent and fictitious one. Nor did He assume it as taken specifically,

8 Cf. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* 6.936C.

because He did not assume all persons. But He did assume it as taken individually, which is the same as that taken specifically. For He assumed the first-fruits of our clay not as self-subsistent and having been an individual previously and as such taken on by Him, but as having its subsistence in His Person. Thus, this Person of the Word of God became Person to the flesh, and in this way 'the Word was made flesh,'¹ and that without any change, and the flesh without transformation was made Word, and God was made man. For the Word is God, and man is God by virtue of the hypostatic union. It is therefore the same thing to say 'the nature of the Word' as it is to say 'the nature taken individually,' for it properly and exclusively shows not the individual, the Person, that is to say, nor that which is common to the Persons, but the common nature as found and discovered in one of the Persons.

Now, union is one thing and incarnation another. This is because union shows the joining, but not that with which the junction is made. Incarnation, however, is the same thing as is meant by saying becoming man, and it shows a joining with the flesh, that is, with man—just as the firing of the steel implies the union with fire. Thus, in explaining the expression 'one incarnate nature of the Word of God,' the blessed Cyril himself in his second letter to Succensus says as follows: 'If we were to speak of one nature of the Word but were to keep silent and not add the "incarnate," thus setting aside, as it were, the dispensation, then they perhaps would not be speaking entirely without reason who might pretend to ask: "If one nature is the whole, then where is the perfection in humanity?" or: "How did the substance which is like ours subsist?" However, since by saying "incarnate" both the perfection in humanity and the indication of the substance like ours have been introduced, let them cease to lean on their reedy staff.'² Here, then, he

¹ John 1.14.

² Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistle* 46 (PG 77.244A).

has used the 'nature' of the Lord in the sense of nature. This is evident because, if he had taken the nature in the sense of Person, it would not have been out of place to say it without the "incarnate," for we are not wrong when we simply say 'one Person of the Word of God.' What is more, Leontius of Byzance³ has likewise understood the expression in the same way as meaning nature, but not nature in the sense of person. And the blessed Cyril himself, in his defense against Theodoret's attacks on the Second Anathema, speaks thus: 'The nature of the Word, that is to say, the Person, which is the Word Himself.'⁴ Consequently, to say 'the nature of the Word' is not to signify the person alone, nor what is common to the Persons, but the common nature as considered wholly in the Person of the Word.

Now although it has been said that the nature of the Word became incarnate, that is, was united to the flesh, we have never heard up to now that the nature of the Word suffered in the flesh. We have, however, been taught that Christ suffered in the flesh. Consequently, saying 'nature of the Word' does not signify the Person. So it remains to say that to have become incarnate means to have been united to the flesh, and that the Word was made flesh means that without suffering change the very Person of the Word became Person of the body. And again, although it has been said that God was made man and man God—for the Word, while being God, was made man without suffering change, yet we have never heard at all that the Godhead was made man, or was incarnate, or put on human nature. We have, however, learned that the Godhead was united to humanity in one of Its Persons. It has also been said that God takes on another form, or substance—ours, that is to say. For the name God applies to each one of the Persons, but we cannot say Godhead in reference to a Person, because we

³ Cf. Leontius, *On Sects* 8.2 (PG 86.1252D-1253A).

⁴ Cyril of Alexandria, *Defense of the Anathemas against Theodoret* 2 (PG 76.401A).

have not heard that the Godhead is the Father alone, or the Son alone, or the Holy Ghost alone. This is because Godhead indicates the nature, whereas Father indicates the Person, just as humanity indicates the nature, and Peter the person. The name God, moreover, also signifies the community of nature and is applied to each of the Persons like a surname, just as the word man is. For God is one who possesses a divine nature, and man is one who possesses a human one.

Furthermore, in connection with all this one must know that the Father and the Holy Ghost in no way participate in the Incarnation of the Word, unless it be in miracles and by complaisance and will.⁵

Chapter 12

And we proclaim the holy Virgin to be properly and truly Mother of God (Θεοτόκος).¹ For, as He who was born of her is true God, so is she truly Mother of God who gave birth to the true God who took His flesh from her. Now, we do not say that God was born of her in the sense that the divinity of the Word has its beginning of being from her, but in the sense that God the Word Himself, who was timelessly begotten of the Father before the ages and exists without beginning and eternally with the Father and the Holy Ghost, did in the last days come for our salvation to dwell in her womb and of her was, without undergoing change, made flesh and born. For the holy Virgin did not give birth to a mere man but to true God, and not to God simply, but to God made flesh. And He did not bring His body down from heaven and come through her as through a channel, but assumed from her a body consubstantial with us

5 Cf. Pseudo-Dionysius, *Divine Names* 2.6 (PG 3.644BC).

1 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Epistle* 101 (PG 37.177-178).

and subsisting in Himself. Now, had the body been brought down from heaven and not been taken from our nature, was there any need for His becoming man? God the Word was made man for this reason: that that very nature which had sinned, fallen, and become corrupt should conquer the tyrant who had deceived it. Thus should it be freed from corruption, as the divine Apostle says: 'For by a man came death: and by a man the resurrection of the dead.'² If the first was true, then so is the second.

If, however, he also says: 'The first Adam was, of earth, earthly: the second Adam, the Lord, from heaven,'³ he is not saying that the body is from heaven.⁴ But it is obvious that He is not a mere man, for notice how he called Him both Adam and Lord—thus indicating that He is both together. For Adam is interpreted as meaning born of earth, and it is obvious that man's nature is born of earth because it was formed from dust. On the other hand, the name Lord is expressive of the divine substance.

And again, the Apostle says: 'God sent his only-begotten Son, made of a woman.'⁵ He did not say *by* a woman, but *of* a woman. Therefore, the divine Apostle meant that the one made man of the Virgin was Himself the only-begotten Son of God and God, and that the Son of God and God was Himself the one born of the Virgin. And he further meant that, in so far as He was made man, He was born corporeally and did not come to inhabit a previously formed man, as a prophet, but Himself substantially and truly became man, that is, He made flesh animated by a rational and intellectual soul subsist in His person and Himself became the Person to it. Now, that is what 'made of a woman' means, for how would the Word of God Himself have been

² 1 Cor. 15.21.

³ 1 Cor. 15.47.

⁴ Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *op. cit.* (PG 37.181BC).

⁵ Gal. 4.4.

made under the law, had it not been that He was made a man of the same substance as ourselves?

Hence, it is rightly and truly that we call holy Mary the Mother of God, for this name expresses the entire mystery of the Incarnation. Thus, if she who gave birth is Mother of God, then He who was born of her is definitely God and also definitely man. For, had He not become man, how could God whose existence is before the ages have been born of a woman? And that the Son of Man is a man is quite evident. Moreover, if He who was born of a woman is God, then it is quite evident that the very one who in respect to His divine and unoriginated nature was begotten of God the Father, and the one who in the last times was born of the Virgin in respect to his originated and temporal nature—His human nature, that is—are one. And this means that our Lord Jesus Christ has one Person, two natures, and two begettings.

However, under no circumstances do we call the holy Virgin Mother of Christ (Χριστοτόκος).⁶ This is because that vessel of dishonor, that foul and loathsome Jew at heart, Nestorius, invented this epithet as an insult to do away with the expression Mother of God and—though he burst with his father Satan—to bring dishonor upon the Mother of God, who alone is truly worthy of honor above all creation. And David is 'Christ,' too, and so is the high priest Aaron, because the royal and priestly offices are both conferred by anointing. Furthermore, any God-bearing (Θεοφόρος) man may be called 'Christ,' yet he is not by nature God, which is why the accursed Nestorius was so insolent as to call Him who was born of the Virgin 'God-bearing.' But God forbid that we should ever speak or think of Him as God-bearing; rather, let it be as God incarnate.⁷ For the very Word of God was conceived of the Virgin and made flesh, but continued to be God after this assumption of the flesh. And,

6 Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistle* 1 (PG 77.20ff.).

7 Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *Against Nestorius* 2 (PG 76.60A).

simultaneously with its coming into being, the flesh was straightway made divine by Him. Thus three things took place at the same time: the assuming of the flesh, its coming into being, and its being made divine by the Word. Hence, the holy Virgin is understood to be Mother of God, and is so called not only because of the nature of the Word but also because of the deification of the humanity simultaneously with which the conception and the coming into being of the flesh were wondrously brought about—the conception of the Word, that is, and the existence of the flesh in the Word Himself. In this the Mother of God, in a manner surpassing the course of nature, made it possible for the Fashioner to be fashioned and for the God and Creator of the universe to become man and deify the human nature which He had assumed, while the union preserved the things united, just as they had been united, that is to say, not only the divinity of Christ but His humanity, also; that which surpassed us and that which was like us. Now, it was not first made like us and then made to surpass us. On the contrary, it was always both from its first beginning of being, because from the first instant of conception it had its existence in the Word Himself. Therefore, while by its own nature it is human, it is also of God and divine in a manner surpassing the course of nature. And what is more, it possessed the properties of the living flesh, since by reason of the Incarnation the Word received them as truly natural in the order of natural motion.

Chapter 13

Since we confess our Lord Jesus Christ to be at once both perfect God and perfect man, we declare that this same One has all things that the Father has, except the being unbegotten, and, with the sole exception of sin, all that the first Adam has; namely, a body and a rational and intel-

lectual soul. We furthermore declare that corresponding to His two natures He has the twofold set of natural properties belonging to the two natures—two natural wills, the divine and the human; two natural operations, a divine and a human; two natural freedoms, a divine and a human; and wisdom and knowledge, both divine and human. For, since He is consubstantial with God the Father, He freely wills and acts as God. And, since He is also consubstantial with us, the same one freely wills and acts as man. Thus, the miracles are His, and so are the sufferings.

Chapter 14

Since, then, Christ has two natures, we say that He has two natural wills and two natural operations. On the other hand, since these two natures have one Person, we say that He is one and the same who wills and acts naturally according to both natures, of which and in which is Christ our God, and which are Christ our God. And we say that He wills and acts in each, not independently, but in concert. 'For in each form He wills and acts in communion with the other.'¹ For the will and operation of things having the same substance is the same, and the will and operation of things having different substances is different.² Conversely, the substance of things having the same will and operation is the same, whereas that of things having a different will and operation is different.

Thus, in Father and Son and Holy Ghost we discover the identity of nature from the identity of the operation and the will. In the divine Incarnation, on the other hand, we discover the difference of the nature from the difference of the wills and operations, and knowing the difference

¹ Leo, *Epistle* 28.4 (PG 54.768B).

² Cf. Maximus, *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91.313D-316A,337B).

of the natures we confess the difference of the wills and operations. For, just as the number of the natures piously understood and declared to belong to one and the same Christ does not divide this one Christ, but shows that the difference of the natures is maintained even in the union, neither does the number of the wills and operations belonging substantially to His natures introduce any division—God forbid—for in both of His natures He wills and acts for our salvation. On the contrary, their number shows the preservation and maintenance of the natures even in the union, and this alone. We do not call the wills and operations personal, but natural. I am referring to that very faculty of willing and acting by force of which things which will will and things which act act. For, if we concede these to be personal, then we shall be forced to say that the three Persons of the Holy Trinity differ in will and operation.

Now, one must know that *willing* is not the same thing as *how one wills*.³ This is because willing, like seeing, is of the nature, since it belongs to all men. How one wills, however, does not belong to nature but to our judgment, just as does how one looks at something, whether it be favorably or unfavorably. All men do not will alike, nor do they see things alike. And this we shall also concede in the case of the operations, for how one wills or sees or acts is a mode of the use of willing or seeing or acting, and this mode belongs to the user alone and distinguishes him from the others in accordance with what is commonly called the *difference*.

Consequently, simple willing is called *will*, or the volitive faculty, which is a natural will and rational appetite. But how one wills, or the subject of the volition, is the object *willed* and will based on judgment. And that is *volitive* which has it in its nature to will. For example, the divine nature is volitive, and so is the human. And finally, he is *willing* who uses the volition, and that is the person; Peter, for example.

³ Cf. *ibid.* (PG 91.292C).

Thus, since Christ is one and has one Person, the divinely willing in Him and the humanly willing are one and the same.⁴ Nevertheless, since He has two natures which are volitive because they are rational, for everything that is rational is both volitive and free, we shall say that in Him there are two volitions, or natural wills. For the same one is volitive in both of His natures, since He assumed the volitive faculty which is inherent in our nature. Furthermore, since Christ is one and it is the same who wills in either nature, we shall say that the thing willed is the same. In saying this, we do not mean that He willed only what He willed naturally as God, for it is not of the nature of God to will to eat, drink, and the like; we mean that He also willed the things which go to make up human nature, not by any contradiction of judgment, but in accordance with the peculiarity of the natures. For, when His divine will willed and permitted the flesh to suffer and to do what was peculiar to it, He willed these things naturally.

Now, that the will naturally belongs to man is evident from the following consideration.⁵ Not counting the divine, there are three kinds of life: the vegetative, the sensitive, and the intellectual. Proper to the vegetative are the motions of nutrition, growth, and reproduction; proper to the sensitive is the motion by impulse; and proper to the rational and intellectual is the free motion. Therefore, if the nutritive motion is proper to the vegetative life and the impulsive to the sensitive, then surely the free motion is proper to the rational and intellectual. But, freedom of motion is nothing else but the will. Consequently, since the Word was made flesh animate, intellectual, and free, He was also made volitive.

Again, things which are natural are not acquired by learning, for no one learns to reason or live or hunger or thirst

⁴ Cf. *ibid.* (PG 91.289 AC).

⁵ Cf. *ibid.* (PG 91.301).

or sleep. And neither do we learn to will. Hence, it is natural to will.

And again, if, while nature rules in irrational beings, it is ruled in man who is freely moved by his will, then man is by nature volitive.

Still, again, if man has been made after the image of the blessed and supersubstantial Godhead, then, since the divine nature is naturally free and volitive, man as its image is also free and volitive by nature. For the Fathers have defined free will as volition.

Furthermore, if to will is inherent in all men and not present in some while absent in others, then, since what is found to be common to all is a characteristic of a nature in the individuals possessing that nature, man is by nature volitive.⁶

And again, if the nature does not admit of more or less, and if to will is inherent in all and is not more in some while less in others, then man is by nature volitive. And so, if man is by nature volitive, the Lord, too, is by nature volitive, not only in so far as He is God but also in so far as He was made man. For, just as He assumed our nature, so also has He assumed our natural will. And it is in this sense that the Fathers say that He impressed our will in Himself.

If the will is not natural, it will either be personal or be against nature. But, if it is personal, then the Son will have a different will from that of the Father, because that which is personal is characteristic of the person alone. And if it is against nature, there will be a defect in the nature, because what is against nature is destructive of what is according to nature.

Now, the God and Father of all things either wills as Father or as God. But, if He wills as Father, His will will be other than that of the Son, because the Son is not the Father. If, however, He wills as God, and the Son is God

⁶ Cf. *ibid.* (PG 91.804CD).

and the Holy Ghost is also God, then the will will belong to the nature; that is to say, it will be natural.

Furthermore, if, as the Fathers say,⁷ those things that have one will have one substance, and if Christ's divinity and humanity have one will, then the substance of the divinity and that of the humanity will be one and the same.

And again, if, as the Fathers say, the natural difference does not appear in the one will, we must either say that there is one will in Christ and no natural difference, or that there is a natural difference and more than one will.

And still again, as the holy Gospel relates, the Lord went 'into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon: and entering into a house, he would that no man should know it. And he could not be hid.'⁸ So, if His divine will was all-powerful and yet He was unable to conceal Himself when He willed to, then it was when willing as man that He was unable to, and as man also He was volitive.

And again, it says: 'Coming to the place he said: I thirst. And they gave him wine to drink mixed with gall. And when he had tasted, he would not drink.'⁹ Now, if it was as God that He thirsted and having tasted did not want to drink, then as God He was subject to passion, for thirst is a passion and so is taste. If, however, it was not as God, then it was entirely as man that He thirsted, and as man also He was volitive.

There is also the blessed Apostle Paul, who says: 'Becoming obedient unto death, even to the death of the cross.'¹⁰ This obedience was a submission of what was really His will and not of what really was not, for we may not call an irrational being either obedient or disobedient. However, the Lord became obedient to the Father not in so far as He was God, but in so far as He was man. For, as God, He is neither

7 Cf. Gregory of Nyssa and others, cited by the Council of Constant. 3 (Oec. 6), Mansi, *op. cit.* 11.400ff.

8 Mark 7.24.

9 Matt. 27.33-34; cf. Maximus, *op. cit.* (PG 91.321AB).

10 Phil. 2.8.

obedient or disobedient, because obedience or disobedience belong to such as are subject to authority, as the inspired Gregory has said.¹¹ Then, as man also, Christ was volitive.

Moreover, when we speak of the natural will, we mean that it is not constrained but free—for, if it is rational, it is also absolutely free. For there is not only the uncreated divine nature which is not subject to constraint, but there is also the created intellectual nature which is not so either. And this is obvious, because, although God is by nature good and creative and God, He is not these things by necessity—for who was there to impose the necessity?

It is furthermore necessary to know that the term *freedom of will* is used equivocally—sometimes being referred to God, sometimes to the angels, and sometimes to men.¹² Thus, with God it is supersubstantial, but with the angels the execution coincides with the inclination without admitting of any interval of time at all. For the angel has freedom by nature and he is unhampered in its exercise because he has neither the opposition from a body nor has he anyone to interfere with him. With men, however, it is such that the inclination precedes the execution in point of time. This is because, though man is free and has this freedom of will naturally, he also has the interference of the Devil to contend with and the motion of the body. Consequently, because of this interference and the burden of the body, the execution comes after the inclination.

If, then, Adam willingly gave ear, and willed and ate, then the will was the first thing to suffer in us. But, if the will was the first thing to suffer, and if, when the Word became incarnate, He did not assume it, then we have not been made free from sin.

And still further, if the nature's power of free will is His work, and yet He did not assume it, it was either because He condemned His own creation as not being good or because

11 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 30.6 (PG 36.109BC).

12 Cf. Maximus, *op. cit.* (PG 91.234D-325A).

He begrudged us our being healed in it. And while He deprived us of perfect healing, He showed Himself subject to suffering without willing or without being able to save us perfectly.

It is furthermore impossible to speak of one thing composed of two wills in the same way that we speak of a person composed of its natures. This is because, in the first place, compounds are made of things that have their own subsistence and are not found to exist by virtue of another principle than their own; whereas, in the second place, if we are to speak of a composition of wills and operations, we shall be forced to admit a composition of the other natural properties, such as the uncreated and the created, the invisible and the visible, and so on. And besides, what will the will that is composed of the wills be called? For it is impossible for the compound to be given the name of the things of which it is composed, since in such a case we should call that which is composed of the natures a *nature* and not a *person*. And further, should we speak of one compound will in Christ, then we are making Him distinct from the Father in will, because the will of the Father is not compound. Accordingly, it remains for us to say that only the Person of Christ is compound, in so far as it is composed of His natures and His natural properties as well.

And, should we wish to speak literally, it would be impossible to speak of *opinion* (γνώμη) and choice in the Lord. For the opinion resulting from the inquiry and deliberation, or counsel and judgment, in respect to the unknown thing is a disposition toward the thing judged. After the opinion comes the choice which selects and chooses one thing rather than the other. Now, since the Lord was not a mere man, but was also God and knew all things, He stood in no need of reflection, inquiry, counsel, or judgment. He also had a natural affinity for good and antipathy for evil.¹³ Thus, it is in this sense that the Prophet Isaías, too, says: 'Before

13 Cf. Basil, *Homily on Psalm 44.8* (PG 29.405B).

the child shall know to refuse the evil, he will choose the good. For before the child know to refuse the evil, and to choose the good, he will reject the evil by choosing the good.¹⁴ The 'before' shows that he made no inquiry or investigation in a human manner, but that, since He was God and divinely subsisted in the flesh—that is to say, was hypostatically united to the flesh—by the fact of His very being and His knowing all things He naturally possessed the good. Now, the virtues are natural, and they are also naturally inherent in all men, even though all of us do not act naturally. For, because of the fall, we went from what is according to nature to what is against it. But the Lord brought us back from what is against nature to what is according to it—for this last is what is meant by 'according to his image and likeness.'¹⁵ Now, asceticism and the labors connected with it were not intended for the acquisition of virtue as of something to be introduced from the outside, but for the expulsion of evil, which has been introduced and is against nature—just as the steel's rust, which is not natural but due to neglect, we remove with hard toil to bring out the natural brightness of the steel.

Moreover, one must know that the word γνώμη, or opinion, is used in many ways and with many meanings. Thus, it sometimes means *advice*, as when the divine Apostle says: 'Now, concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord: but I give counsel.'¹⁶ Sometimes it implies *design*, as when the Prophet David says: 'They have taken a malicious counsel against thy people.'¹⁷ Sometimes it means *judgment*, as when Daniel says: 'Why so cruel a sentence had gone forth.'¹⁸ And sometimes it is used in the sense of *faith*, or *notion*, or of *intent*—to put it simply, the word γνώμη has twenty-eight different meanings.

14 Cf. Isa. 7.16.

15 Gen. 1.26.

16 1 Cor. 7.25.

17 Ps. 82.4.

18 Dan. 2.15.

Chapter 15

Now, we also say that in our Lord Jesus Christ there are two operations.¹ For, in so far as He was God and consubstantial with the Father, like the Father He had the divine operation; in so far as He was made man and consubstantial with us, He had the operation of the human nature.

However, one must know that operation is one thing, what is operative another, which is operated another, and still another the operator. *Operation*, then, is the efficacious and substantial motion of the nature. And that which is *operative* is the nature from which the operation proceeds. That which is *operated* is the effect of the operation. And the *operator* is the one who performs the operation; the person, that is. However, the term operation is also used for the effect, and the term for the effect for the operation, as 'creation' is used for 'creature.' For in that way we say 'all creation,' meaning 'all creatures.'

One must know that the operation is a motion and that it is operated rather than operating, as Gregory the Theologian says in his sermon on the Holy Ghost: 'But if He is an operation, then He will obviously be operated and will not operate. And, as soon as He has been effected, He will cease.'²

It is further necessary to know that life itself is an operation, and the primary operation of the animal. So also is the whole vital process—the motions of nutrition and growth, or the vegetative;³ the impulsive, or the sensitive; and the intellectual and free motions. Operation, moreover, is the perfection of a potentiality. So, if we find all these things in Christ, then we shall declare that He also has a human operation.

1 The *operation*, or *energy*, is the capacity or power to act inherent in every nature.

2 Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 31.6 (PG 36.140A).

3 By a misprint the Migne text has 'natural' for the 'vegetative' of Lequien's original text.

The first thought (νόημα) formed in us is called an operation. It is a simple unrelated operation by which the mind of itself secretly puts forth those thoughts of its own without which it could not rightly be called mind (νοῦς). And again, that is also called an operation which is the expression and explanation of what has been thought by means of speech utterance. This, however, is no longer unrelated and simple. On the contrary, since it is composed of thought and speech, it is found to be in a relation. And the very relation which the doer has to the thing done is also an operation. And the thing itself which is effected is called an operation. Now, the first of these belongs to the soul alone, the next to the soul as using the body, the next to the body as endowed with an intellectual soul, and the last of them is the effect. Thus, the mind first considers the thing to be done and then acts accordingly through the body. So, it is to the soul that the control belongs, since it uses the body as an instrument which it guides and directs. The operation of the body as guided and moved by the soul, however, is a different one. And as to the effect, while that of the body is, as it were, the touching, holding, and clasping of the thing made, that of the soul is the thing's formation and configuration. It was also the same with our Lord Jesus Christ. While the power of working miracles was an operation of His divinity, the work of His hands, His willing, and His saying: 'I will. Be thou made clean,'⁴ were operations belonging to His humanity. And as to the effect, the breaking of the loaves, the hearing the leper, and the 'I will' belong to His human nature, whereas to His divine nature belong the multiplication of the loaves and the cleansing of the leper. Now, by both, that is, by the operation of the soul and that of the body, He showed His divine operation to be one and the same, akin and equal. And just as we know that the natures are united and mutually immanent and still do not deny their difference, but even number them, while we know

⁴ Matt. 8.3.

them to be indivisible; so also do we know the connection of the wills and operations, while we recognize their difference and number them without introducing any division. For, as the flesh was made divine, yet suffered no change in its own nature, in the same way the will and operation were made divine, yet did not exceed their proper limits. For He is one who is both the one thing and the other and who wills and acts in both one way and the other, that is to say, both in a divine and in a human fashion.

Accordingly, because of the duality of His nature, it is necessary to affirm two operations in Christ. For things having diverse natures have different operations, and things having diverse operations have different natures. And conversely, things having the same nature have the same operation, and things having one operation have also one substance, as the inspired Fathers declare. Consequently, we must do one of two things: either we shall say that there is one operation in Christ and then say that His substance is one; or, if we keep to the truth, we shall confess with the Gospels and the Fathers that there are two substances, and at the same time we shall be confessing that there are also two operations corresponding to these. For, since in His divinity He is consubstantial with God the Father, He will also be equal to Him in His operation. On the other hand, since in His humanity He is consubstantial with us, He will also be equal to us in His operation. Indeed, the blessed Gregory, who was Bishop of Nyssa, says: 'Things having one operation very definitely have the same potentiality, also.'⁵ For every operation is the perfection of a potentiality. Moreover, it is impossible for there to be one nature, potentiality, or operation belonging both to an uncreated nature and to a created one. And, were we to say that Christ has one nature, we

⁵ Lequien assigns this to the *Oratio de natura et hypostasi* of Gregory of Nyssa, which is really Basil's *Epistle* 38 (*On the Difference between Substance and Hypostasis*), (PG 32.325-340), but which does not contain the present quotation. It probably is from Gregory's *Against Eunomius* 1 (cf. PG 45.373-CD).

should be attributing the passions of the intellectual soul to the divinity of the Word—fear, I mean, and grief, and anguish.

However, should they say that in discussing the Blessed Trinity the holy Fathers said: 'Things having one substance also have one operation, and things which have different substances also have different operations,' and that one must not transfer to the human nature what belongs to the divine, we shall reply as follows. If this was said by the Fathers in respect to the divinity only, then the Son does not have the same operation as the Father and He is not even of the same substance. And, what is more, to whom shall we attribute the words: 'My Father worketh until now, and I work'; and 'What things soever he seeth the Father doing, these things the Son also doth in like manner'; and 'If you do not believe me, believe my works'; and 'The works which I do give testimony of me'; and 'As the Father raiseth up the dead and giveth life: so the Son also giveth life to whom He will'?⁶ For all these show that even after the Incarnation He is not only consubstantial with the Father but also has the same operation.⁷

And again, if the providence exercised over creatures belongs not only to the Father and the Holy Ghost, but also to the Son even after the Incarnation, and if this is an operation, then even after the Incarnation He has the same operation as the Father.

And if from His miracles we perceive Christ to be of the same substance as the Father, and if miracles are an operation of God, then even after the Incarnation He has the same operation as the Father.

And if His divinity and His flesh have one operation, it will be composite, and either He will have a different operation from that of the Father, or the Father's operation will

⁶ John 5.17,19; 10.38; 5.36,21.

⁷ Cf. Maximus, *op. cit.* (PG 91.348D-349A).

be composite, too. But, if the Father's operation is composite, it is obvious that His nature will be, too.

And, if they were to say that the introduction of the operation requires that of a person along with it,⁸ we should reply that, if the introduction of the operation requires that of a person along with it, then by logical conversion the introduction of the person will require that of an operation along with it. In such a case, since there are three Persons, or hypostases, in the Holy Trinity, there will also be three operations; or, since there is one operation, there will also be one Person and one hypostasis. But the holy Fathers were all agreed in declaring that things having the same substance also have the same operation.

What is more, if the introduction of the operation requires that of a person, then those who decreed that neither one nor two operations be affirmed in Christ⁹ in doing so ordered that neither one nor two persons be affirmed in Him.

And then, just as the natures of both the fire and the steel are preserved intact in the red-hot knife,¹⁰ so also are there two operations and their effects. For, while the steel has its cutting power, the fire has its power of burning; and the cut is the effect of the operation of the steel, while the burn is that of the operation of the fire. And the distinction between these is preserved in the burnt cut and the cut burn, even though the burning of the cut does not take place separately after the union, and the cut is not made separately from the burn. Neither do we say that because of the twofold natural operation there are two red-hot knives, nor do we destroy their substantial difference because of the singleness of the red-hot knife. In just the same way there is in Christ both the divine and all-powerful operation of His divinity, and that after our own fashion, which is that of His humanity.

⁸ Cf. *ibid.* (PG 91.337B).

⁹ The *Ecthesis*, published in 638 by Emperor Heraclius, forbade the use of the expression of one or two operations in Christ, but asserted one will. This precipitated the Monothelite schism (640-657).

¹⁰ Cf. Maximus, *op. cit.* (PG 91.337D-340A).

Thus, the child's being taken by the hand and drawn up¹¹ was an effect of His human operation, whereas her being restored to life was an effect of His divine operation. For the latter is one thing and the former another, even though they are inseparable in the theandric operation. What is more, if, because the Person of the Lord is one, His operation must also be one, then because of the one Person there must also be one substance.

Again, if we were to affirm one operation in the Lord, we should be saying that this was either divine or human or neither.¹² Now, if we say that it is divine, we shall be saying that He is only God and devoid of our humanity. And if we say that it is human, we shall be uttering the blasphemy that He is mere man. But, if we say that it is neither divine nor human, we shall be saying that He is neither consubstantial with the Father nor with us. For the identity of person came from the union, without in any way destroying the difference of the natures. And, if the difference of the natures is kept intact, their operations will plainly be kept so, also, because there is no nature without any operation.

If the operation of the Lord Christ is one,¹³ then it will be either created or uncreated; for, just as there is no intermediate nature between the created and the uncreated, neither is there any such operation. Therefore, if it is created, it will show only a created nature; if it is uncreated, it will indicate an uncreated substance only. This is because the natural properties must correspond with the natures absolutely, since the existence of a defective nature is impossible. The natural operation, moreover, does not come from anything outside the nature and it is obvious that the nature can neither exist nor be known without its natural operation.

11 Cf. Luke 8.54.

12 Maximus, *op. cit.* (PG 91.340C).

13 Cf. *ibid.* (PG 91.341A).

For, by remaining invariable in its operations, each thing gives proof of its own nature.

If Christ's operation is one, then the same operation can do divine and human things. But, no being acting according to nature can do things which are contrary. Thus, fire does not make hot and cold, nor does water make wet and dry. How, then, did He, who is God by nature and who became man by nature, both work the miracles and experience the passions with one operation?

Now, if Christ assumed a human mind, that is to say, a rational and intellectual soul, He certainly thinks and will always think. But, thinking is an operation of the mind. Therefore, Christ acts as a man also and will always so act.

The most wise and great St. John Chrysostom in the second homily of his commentary on the Acts says this: 'No one should be wrong in calling His suffering an action. For by suffering all things He did that great and wonderful work of destroying death and working all the rest.'¹⁴

If every operation is defined as a substantial motion of some nature, as those who are well versed in these matters have clearly laid down, where has anyone seen a nature without a motion or without any operation at all, or where has anyone found an operation which is not a motion of a natural power? And, according to the blessed Cyril,¹⁵ no one in his right mind would hold the natural operation of God and of a creature to be one. It is not the human nature that restores Lazarus to life, nor is it the power of the divinity that sheds tears. For tears are peculiar to humanity, whereas life belongs to the Subsistent Life. Nevertheless, by reason of the identity of the person each one of these actions is common to both natures.¹⁶ For Christ is one, and one is His Person, or hypostasis. Nevertheless, He has two natures: that of His divinity and that of His humanity. Consequently,

¹⁴ *Homily 1 on the Acts 3* (PG 60.18).

¹⁵ Cf. *Thesaurus* 32.2 (PG 75.453B).

¹⁶ Cf. Leo, *Epistle* 28.4 (PL 54.772A).

the glory which proceeds naturally from the divinity became common to both by reason of the identity of person, while the humble things proceeding from the flesh became common to both. For He is one and the same who is both the one thing and the other, that is, both God and man; and to the same one belong both what is proper to the divinity and what is proper to the humanity. Thus, while the divinity worked the miracles but not separately from the flesh, the flesh did the humble things but not apart from the divinity. Thus, also, while remaining impassible, the divinity was joined to the suffering flesh and made the sufferings salutary. And the sacred mind was joined to the acting divinity of the Word and thought and knew the things which were being done.

Therefore, the divinity communicates its excellences to the flesh while remaining with no part of the sufferings of the flesh. For His flesh did not suffer through the divinity in the same way that the divinity acted through the flesh, because the flesh served as an instrument of the divinity. So, even though from the first instant of conception there was no divisions whatsoever of either form, but all the actions of each form at all times belonged to one Person, we nevertheless in no way confuse these things which were done inseparably. On the contrary, from the nature of the works we perceive to which form they belong.

And so, Christ acts through each of His natures and in Him each nature acts in communion with the other.¹⁷ The Word does whatever pertains to the kingdom and the principality, which is what belongs to Him by reason of the authority and the power of His divinity, while the body in accordance with the intent of the Word united to it does what has also become proper to it. Now, the body of itself had no inclination for physical suffering, nor yet did it avoid and refuse to accept what was painful. Neither was it affected by external influences; rather, it was moved in accordance

17 Cf. *ibid.* (PL 54.768B).

with the order of its nature, with the Word wisely willing and permitting it to suffer and do what was proper to it, so that through its works the truth of its nature might be guaranteed.

Moreover,¹⁸ even as He was conceived of a virgin and put on substance in a way that transcended substance, so does He also do human things in a way that transcends the human—as when He walked with His earthly feet upon unstable water which had not become earth but by the supernatural power of His divinity was made firm and did not yield to the weight of material feet. He did not do human things in a human way, because He was not only man, but God, also, which is the reason why His sufferings were life-giving and saving. Neither did He do divine things in a divine way, because He was not only God, but man, also, which is the reason why He worked miracles by touch and word and other such things.

And should someone say¹⁹ that we do not hold one operation in Christ because we do away with the human operation, but because the human operation as contrasted with the divine is called passion, and in this sense we say that there is one operation in Christ—should they say this: We shall reply that by this token they who hold one nature do not do so in the sense of doing away with the human nature, but because the human nature as contrasted with the divine is called passible. God forbid that we should call the human motion passion just because of its contrast with the divine operation. For, generally speaking, nothing is known or defined as having its real existence from contrast or comparison. In such a case, things which exist would be found to be mutually causative of each other. Thus if, because the divine motion is action, the human is passion, then it will definitely follow that, because the divine nature is good, the

18 Cf. Pseudo-Dionysius, *Divine Names* 2.10, *Epistle* 4 (PG 3.648-649; 1072).

19 Cf. Maximus, *op. cit.* (PG 91.349C).

human will be evil. Conversely, because the human motion is called passion, the divine is called action; and because human nature is evil, the divine will be good. What is more, all creatures will thus be evil, and he will be a liar who said: 'And God saw all the things that he had made, and they were very good.'²⁰

Now we say that the holy Fathers gave the human motion a variety of names, depending upon the fundamental concept in question.²¹ Thus, they called it both power, operation, difference, movement, property, quality, and passion. And they did not do this by way of contrast to the divine motion. On the contrary, they called it *power*, in so far as it is sustaining and unchangeable; *operation*, as being distinctive and showing the invariability in all things of the same species; *difference*, as being defining; *motion*, as being indicative; *property*, as being component and as belonging to this alone and not to some other; *quality*, as being specific; and *passion*, as being moved. For all things which are from God and after Him are subject to being moved, since they are not motion or force itself. Consequently, it was not so named by contrast, as has been said, but after the principle that was put in it at its creation by the cause which framed the universe. For this reason, it was called operation, even when mentioned together with the divine motion. For what else did he do, who said: 'For each form acts in communion with the other,'²² than he who said: 'And he had fasted forty days and forty nights, afterwards he was hungry'²³—for, when He wished, He permitted His nature to do what was proper to it? Or what else did he do than those who said that there was a different operation in Him, or a twofold operation, or one and another? For by the opposition of terms these expressions signify two natures, since the number is

²⁰ Gen. 1.31.

²¹ Cf. Maximus, *op. cit.* (PG 91.325AB).

²² See above, note 17.

²³ Matt. 4.2.

oftentimes indicated by the opposition of terms, just as well as it is by saying 'divine and human.' Thus, the difference is a difference of things which differ. And how can things differ which do not exist?

Chapter 16

Since each individual man is made up of two natures—that of the soul and that of the body—and has these unchanged in himself, it will be reasonable to say that he has two natures. For even after the union he retains the natural property of each. Thus, the body is not immortal but corruptible, and the soul is not mortal but immortal. Neither is the body invisible, nor is the soul visible to bodily eyes. On the contrary, the latter is rational and understanding and incorporeal, whereas the former is material and visible and irrational. Moreover, things which are distinct in substance do not have the same nature; consequently, the soul and the body are not of the same substance.

And again, if man is a rational mortal animal, and if every definition designates the natures defined, and if, furthermore, that which is rational is not the same as that which is mortal as respects the concept of nature, then by the norm of his own definition man will not have one nature.

Now, should man at times be said to have one nature, the term 'nature' is being taken in the sense of 'species.' Thus, we say that one man does not differ from another by any difference in nature, because, to the contrary, all men fall under the same definition, in so far as they all are composed of body and soul and have the same makeup, each individual being two constituent natures. And this is not unreasonable, because the divine Athanasius in his discourse against the blasphemers of the Holy Ghost said that all created things have the same nature, when he wrote to the effect that the Holy Ghost is over and above creation

and that it is possible to see clearly that, while in relation to the nature of created things He is something else, to the divinity He is proper.¹ Everything that is found to be common to several things without being more in one and less in another is said to be essence. Therefore, since every man is made up of a soul and a body, in this sense men are said to have one nature. As regards the Person of the Lord, however, we cannot speak of one nature, because even after the union each nature retains its natural property and it is not possible to find a species of Christs. For there has been no other Christ made of divinity and humanity, the same being both God and man.

And again, the specific unity of man is not the same thing as the substantial unity of soul and body. For the specific unity of man shows the invariable element in all men, whereas the substantial unity of soul and body destroys their very being and reduces them to absolute non-existence. For either the one will be transformed into the substance of the other, or from two different things a third will be made, or they will remain within their proper limits and be two natures. For it is not by reason of its substance that the body is identical with that which is incorporeal. Consequently, when people speak of one nature in man, not on account of the identity of the substantial quality of the body with that of the soul, but on account of the invariability of the individuals falling under the species, they do not also have to say that in Christ, in whom there is no species comprising several persons, there is one nature.

And further, every composite is said to be composed of those things which have been put together directly. Thus, we do not say that the house is composed of earth and water, but of bricks and wood. Otherwise, we should also have to say that man is made up of five natures at least, of the four elements, that is, and of a soul. So also, in the

¹ Athanasius, *Epistle 1 to Serapion* 12,17,22 et passim (PG 26.561,569, 581, et al.).

case of our Lord Jesus Christ we do not consider the part or parts, but those which have been put together directly—the divinity and the humanity.

Further, if by saying that man is two natures we shall be forced to say that there are three natures in Christ, then you, too, by saying that man is of two natures will be teaching that Christ is of three natures. And it will be the same way with the operations, because the operation must correspond with the nature. Witness to the fact that man is said to and does have two natures is Gregory the Theologian, who says:² ‘God and man are two natures, as, indeed, are soul and body.’ Also, in his sermon on baptism he says as follows: ‘Since we are twofold, being of soul and body—of the visible and of the invisible nature—so also is the purification twofold: by water and by the Holy Ghost.’

Chapter 17

One should know that it is not by a transformation of nature or by change or alteration or mingling that the Lord’s flesh is said to have been deified and made identical with God and God, as Gregory the Theologian says: ‘The one of whom did deify, while the other was made divine and, I may confidently say, identical with God. And that which anointed became man, and that which was anointed became God.’¹ This was by no transformation of nature but by the union through dispensation, the hypostatic union, I mean, by which the flesh is inseparably united to God, the Word, and by the mutual indwelling of the natures such as that we also speak of in the case of the heating of the steel. For, just as we confess that the Incarnation was brought about without transformation or change, so also do we hold that

² *Epistle* 101 (PG 37.180A); *Sermon* 40.8 (PG 36.368AB).

¹ *Sermon* 45.13 (PG 36.640D-641A).

the deification of the flesh was brought about. For the Word neither overstepped the bounds of His own divinity nor the divine prerogatives belonging to it just because He was made flesh; and, when the flesh was made divine, it certainly did not change its own nature or its natural properties. For even after the union the natures remained unmingled and their properties unimpaired. Moreover, by reason of its most unalloyed union with the Word, that is to say, the hypostatic union, the Lord's flesh was enriched with the divine operations but in no way suffered any impairment of its natural properties. For not by its own operation does the flesh do divine works, but by the Word united to it, and through it the Word shows His own operation. Thus, the steel which has been heated burns, not because it has a naturally acquired power of burning, but because it has acquired it from its union with the fire.²

And so the same flesh was mortal in itself and life-giving by its hypostatic union with the Word. Likewise, we say that the deification of the will was not by a transformation of its natural motion, but by its becoming united with His divine and almighty will and being the will of God made man.³ It was for this reason that, when He wished to be hid, He could not of Himself,⁴ because it pleased God the Word that it be shown that in Himself He had the weakness of the human will. However, it was by willing that He worked the cure of the leper,⁵ and this because of the union with the divine will.

One must furthermore know that the deification of the nature and the will is very expressive and indicative of the two natures and the two wills. For, just as heating does not transform the nature of the thing heated into that of fire, but, rather, brings out both the thing heated and the thing heating and shows not one thing but two, so neither does

2 Maximus, *op. cit.* (PG 91.337D-340A).

3 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 30.12 (PG 36.117C-120A).

4 Cf. Mark 7.24.

5 Cf. Matt. 8.3.

the deification produce one compound nature, but, rather, the two natures and their hypostatic union. In fact, Gregory the Theologian says: 'The one of whom did deify, while the other was made divine,'⁶ where by saying 'of whom' and 'the one' and 'the other' he showed that there were two.

Chapter 18

When we say that Christ is perfect God and perfect man we are attributing to Him absolutely all the natural properties which belong to the Father and to His Mother. For He became man in order that that which had been conquered might conquer. Now, it was not impossible for Him who can do all things to deliver man from the tyrant by His almighty power and might; but, had the tyrant after having conquered man been prevailed over by God, he would have had grounds for complaint. For this reason the compassionate and loving God wished to make the victor him who had fallen, and so He became man and restored like by like.

Moreover, no one will deny that man is a rational and intellectual animal. How, then, did He become man if He assumed a soulless body or a mindless soul? For that sort of thing is no man. Further, what profit do we have from the Incarnation if he who was the first to suffer has not been saved, renewed, or strengthened by being conjoined with the Godhead? For that which has not been assumed has not been healed. And so, He assumes the whole man, who had fallen through weakness, and his most noble part, in order that He might grace the whole with salvation.¹ What is more, there never could be a mind without wisdom and bereft of knowledge, for, were the mind without operation and motion, it would also be absolutely non-existent.

⁶ *Sermon* 45.9 (*PG* 36.633D).

¹ Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Epistle* 101, *passim* (*PG* 37.176ff).

God the Word, then, wishing to restore that which was in His image, became man. But what is in His image, if it is not the mind? Did He, then, disregard what was better and assume what was worse? For mind stands midway between God and the flesh as being a companion of the flesh on the one hand and on the other an image of God. Thus, mind is associated with Mind and the mind holds the middle place between purity of God and the grossness of the flesh. And, had the Lord assumed a mindless soul, He would have assumed the soul of a brute animal.

Now, although the Evangelist did say that the Word was made flesh, one must know that in sacred Scripture man is sometimes called 'soul,' as when it says that 'all the souls of the house of Jacob, that entered into Egypt, were seventy-five,'² and sometimes 'flesh,' as when it says that 'all flesh shall see the salvation of God.'³ So, the Lord was not made flesh without soul or mind, but He was made man. In fact, He says: 'Why do you seek to kill me, a man who have spoken truth to you?'⁴ Therefore, He assumed a body animated by a rational and intellectual soul having dominion over the flesh, but itself being under the dominion of the divinity of the Word.

Consequently, while He had naturally the power of willing both as God and as man, the human will followed after and was subordinated to His will, not being motivated by its own opinion, but willing what His divine will willed. Thus, it was with the permission of the divine will that He suffered what was naturally proper to Him.⁵ And when He begged to be spared death, He did so naturally, with His divine will willing and permitting, and He was in agony and afraid. Then, when His divine will willed that His human will choose death, the passion was freely accepted by it, because it was not as God alone that He freely delivered Himself over to

2 Gen. 46.27 (Septuagint).

3 Luke 3.6.

4 John 8.40.

5 Cf. Sophronius, Synodic Letter (PG 87.3173B).

death, but as man, also. Whence, He also gave us the grace of courage in the face of death. Thus, indeed, He says before His saving passion: 'Father, if it is possible, let this chalice pass from me.'⁶ It was manifestly as man that He was to drink the chalice, for it was not as God. Consequently, it is as man that He wishes the chalice to pass, and these are words arising from a natural fear. 'But yet not my will, but thine be done,'⁷ that is to say: 'In so far as I am of another substance than thine, but thine, which is mine and thine in so far as I am begotten consubstantial with thee.' Again, these are the words of courage. For, since by His good pleasure the Lord had truly become man, His soul at first experienced the weakness of nature and through sense perception felt a natural pain at the thought of its separation from the body; then it was strengthened by the divine will and faced death courageously. For, since He was entirely God with His humanity and entirely man with His divinity, He as man in Himself and through Himself subjected His humanity to God the Father and became obedient to the Father, thus setting for us a most noble example and pattern.

Moreover, He willed freely with His divine and His human will, for free will is absolutely inherent in every rational nature. After all, of what good can rationality be to a nature that does not reason freely? Now, the Creator has implanted a natural appetite in brute beasts which constrains them to act for the preservation of their own nature. For, since they lack reason, they cannot lead; rather, they are led by their natural appetite. Whence it is that the instinct to act arises simultaneously with the appetite, for they enjoy neither the use of reason nor that of counsel or reflection or judgment. For this reason they are neither praised and deemed good for practicing virtue nor punished for doing evil. The rational nature, however, has its natural appetite, which

⁶ Matt. 26.39.

⁷ Luke 22.42.

becomes aroused, but is guided and controlled by the reason in regard to what is for the maintenance of the natural order. This, namely free will, is an advantage of the power of reason and we call it a natural motion in the reasoning faculty. Wherefore, the rational nature is both praised and deemed good for practicing virtue and punished for practicing vice.

And so, the Lord's soul was freely moved to will, but it freely willed those things which His divine will willed it to will. For the flesh was not moved by the command of the Word in the same way that Moses and all the saints were moved by the divine command. On the contrary, since the same one was both God and man, He willed according to His divine and His human will. Wherefore, it was not in opinion that the Lord's two wills differed from each other, but in natural power. For His divine will was without beginning and all-creating and having the corresponding power, and it was impassible. But his human will had a beginning in time and was itself subject to natural and irreprehensible passions. Although by its own nature it was not omnipotent, it was so in so far as it had been made to belong truly and naturally to God the Word.

Chapter 19

When the blessed Dionysius said that Christ had used a certain new theandric operation with us,¹ he was not doing away with the natural operations and saying that there was one operation proceeding from the human and divine natures. For, if such were the case, we might also say that there was one new nature made from the human and the divine, because, according to the holy Fathers, things which have one operation also have one substance. On the contrary, he wanted to show that the new and ineffable manner of the

¹ Cf. *Epistle 4* (PG 3.1072C).

manifestation of the natural operations in Christ was consonant with the mutual indwelling of Christ's natures in each other, and that His living as a man was both unusual and incredible and unknown to the nature of things. He also wanted to show the manner of the exchange arising from the ineffable union. Thus, we do not say that the operations are separated and that the natures act separately, but we say that they act conjointly, with each nature doing in communion with the other that which it has proper to itself. He did not perform the human actions in a human way, because He was not a mere man, nor did He perform the divine actions in a divine way only, because He was not just God, but God and man together. And just as we understand both the union of the natures and their natural difference, so also do we understand that of the natural wills and operations.

So that one must know that while we sometimes speak as of two natures in our Lord Jesus Christ, we sometimes speak as of one person, and that both the former way of speaking and the latter refer to the same concept. For the two natures are one Christ and the one Christ is two natures. It is therefore the same thing to say that Christ acts according to each of His natures and to say that each nature in Christ acts in association with the other. Accordingly, when the flesh is acting, the divine nature is associated with it because the flesh is being permitted by the good pleasure of the divine will to suffer and do what is proper to it and because the operation of the flesh is absolutely salutary—which last does not belong to the human operation, but to the divine. And when the divinity of the Word is acting, the flesh is associated with it, because the divine operations are being performed by the flesh as by an instrument and because He who is acting at once in a divine and human way is one.

One should furthermore know that His sacred mind performs His natural operations, both understanding and knowing itself to be the mind of God and adored by all creation,

but at the same time still mindful of His doings and sufferings on earth. It is, moreover, associated with the operation of the divinity of the Word by which the universe is ordered and controlled, understanding and knowing and ordering not as a mere human mind, but as one hypostatically united to God and reckoned as the mind of God.

Thus, the theandric operation shows this: when God became man, that is to say, was incarnate, His human operation was divine, that is to say, deified. And it was not excluded from His divine operation, nor was His divine operation excluded from His human operation. On the contrary, each is found in the other. Now, when one expresses two things with one word, this figure of speech is called circumlocution (περίφρασις).² Thus, while we speak of the cut burn and the burnt cut of the red-hot knife, we nevertheless hold the cutting to be one operation and the burning another, the one belonging to one nature and the other to the other—the burning to the fire and the cutting to the steel. In the very same way, when we speak of one theandric operation of Christ, we understand the two operations of His two natures: the divine operation of the divinity and the human operation of the humanity.

Chapter 20

Moreover, we confess that He assumed all the natural and blameless passions of man. This is because He assumed the whole man and everything that is his, except sin—for this last is not natural and it was not implanted in us by the Creator. On the contrary, it grew up in our will from the oversowing of the Devil, freely and not prevailing over us by force. Now, those passions are natural and blameless which are not under our control and have come into man's life as a result of the condemnation occasioned by his fall. Such, for example, were hunger, thirst, fatigue, pain,

² Cf. Maximus, *Opuscula* (PG 91.100D).

the tears, the destruction, the shrinking from death, the fear, the agony from which came the sweating and drops of blood, the aid brought by the angels in deference to the weakness of His nature, and any other such things as are naturally inherent in all men.

So, He assumed all that He might sanctify all. He was put to the test and He conquered that He might gain for us the victory and give to our nature the power to conquer the Adversary, so that through the very assaults by which the nature had been conquered of old it might conquer its former victor.

Now, the Evil One attacked from the outside, just as he had with Adam, and not through thoughts—for it was not through thoughts that he attacked Adam, but through the serpent. The Lord, however, repelled the attack and it vanished like smoke, so that by being conquered the passions which had assailed Him might become easy for us to conquer and the new Adam thus be restored by the old.

Actually, our natural passions were in Christ according to nature and over and above nature. Thus, it was according to nature that they were aroused in Him, when He permitted the flesh to suffer what was proper to it; whereas it was over and above nature, because in the Lord the things of nature did not control the will. For with Him nothing is found to be done under compulsion; on the contrary, everything was done freely. Thus, it was by willing that He hungered and by willing that He thirsted, by willing that He was afraid and by willing that He died.

Chapter 21

One should know that He did assume an ignorant and servile nature, and this is because man's nature is subservient to God who made it, and it does not have knowledge of

future events. If, then, like Gregory the Theologian,¹ you distinguish what is seen from what is thought, then the flesh will be said to be servile and ignorant. However, by reason of the identity of person and the inseparable union, the Lord's soul enjoyed the knowledge of future events as well as the other signs of divinity. For, just as the flesh of men is not of its own nature life-giving, whereas that of the Lord, being hypostatically united to God the Word Himself, became life-giving by reason of its hypostatic union with the Word without losing its natural mortality, and we cannot say that it was not and is not always so; in the same way, while His human nature did not of its essence have knowledge of future events, the Lord's soul, by reason of its union with God the Word Himself and the identity of person, did, as I have said, enjoy, along with the other signs of divinity, the knowledge of future events, also.

One must furthermore know that we can by no means call Him servile, because the terms 'servitude' and 'mastery' are not indicative of nature, but of relationships, just as 'paternity' and 'filiation' are. These last do not belong to the essence, but are indicative of relation. Therefore, we say here, just as we did in the case of ignorance, that if you distinguish the created from the uncreated by tenuous thought processes, or subtle imaginings, then the flesh is servile as long as it is not united to God the Word. But, once it is hypostatically united, how will it be servile? For, since Christ is one, He cannot be His own servant and Lord, because these do not belong to the things predicated absolutely, but to them that are predicated relatively. So, whose servant will He be? The Father's? But then, if He is the servant of the Father, the Son does not have 'all things whatsoever the Father hath.'² And He certainly is not His own servant. And, if He is Himself a servant, how is it that in regard to us, who have been adopted through Him, the Apostle says: 'There-

1 Cf. *Sermon* 30.15 (PG 36.124B).

2 John 16.15.

fore, now thou art not a servant, but a son.'³ Therefore, although He is not a servant, He is commonly so called as having for our sake taken on the form of a servant, and together with us He has been called one. For, although He was impassible, He became subject to passion and was made minister of our salvation. Now, they who say that He is a servant divide the one Christ into two, just as Nestorius did. But we say that He is Lord and Master of all creation, the one Christ, the same being at once both God and man, and that He knows all things, 'for in him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.'⁴

Chapter 22

He is said to have progressed in wisdom and age and grace,¹ because He did increase in age and by this increase in age brought more into evidence the wisdom inherent in Him; further, because by making what is ours altogether His own He made His own the progress of men in wisdom and grace, as well as the fulfillment of the Father's will, which is to say, men's knowledge of God and their salvation.² Now, those who say that He progressed in wisdom and grace in the sense of receiving an increase in these are saying that the union was not made from the first instant of the flesh's existence. Neither are they holding the hypostatic union, but, misled³ by the empty-headed Nestorius, they are talking preposterously of a relative union and simple indwelling, 'understanding neither the things they say, nor whereof they affirm.'⁴ For, if from the first instant of its existence the

³ Gal. 4.7 according to the Greek text.

⁴ Col. 2.3.

¹ Cf. Luke 2.52.

² Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 43.38 (PG 36.548BC).

³ Through a misprint, the Migne text is incorrect here; cf. Lequien, *Opera* 247.

⁴ 1 Tim. 1.7.

flesh was truly united to God the Word—rather, had existence in Him and identity of person with Him—how did it not enjoy perfectly all wisdom and grace? It did not share the grace and neither did it participate by grace in the things of the Word; rather, because the human and divine things had become proper to the one Christ by the hypostatic union, then, since the same was at once God and man, it gushed forth with the grace and the wisdom and the fullness of all good things for the world.

Chapter 23

The word *fear* has two meanings. Thus, there is natural fear when the soul is unwilling to be separated from the body because of the natural feeling of affinity and kinship implanted in it by the Creator from the beginning. On account of this it is naturally afraid and distressed and it shrinks from death. The definition of this kind of fear is: Natural fear is a force which clings to existence by withdrawal.¹ The reason for this is that, if all things have been brought into existence from non-existence by the Creator, they naturally do not have the desire for non-existence. Furthermore, a natural property of these things is their instinctive tendency toward those things by which they are sustained. So, when God the Word was made man, He, too, had this appetite. On the one hand, by desiring both food and drink and sleep and by being naturally acquainted with these He showed His inclination for the things which sustained His nature; on the other, He showed His disinclination for things destructive of His nature, as when He freely withdrew from death at the time of His passion. For, even though what happened came about by a law of nature, it was not by compulsion as with us, because He freely willed to accept what was natural. Hence, this kind of fear and fright and distress

¹ Cf. Maximus, *Disputation with Pyrrhus* (PG 91.297D).

belongs to the passions which are natural and blameless and are not subject to sin.

There is still another kind of fear which arises from loss of reason, from mistrust, and from not knowing the hour of one's death—as when we are frightened at night by the making of some noise. This is unnatural, and we define it: *Unnatural fear* is an unreasonable withdrawal. This kind the Lord did not have. Wherefore, except at the time of His passion, He was never afraid—even though for good reason He would oftentimes hide himself. For He was not ignorant of the time.

That He truly experienced fear is affirmed by the divine Athanasius in his discourse against Apollinaris:² 'For this reason the Lord said: "Now is my soul troubled."³ And the "now" means this, namely, at the time when He willed; but all the same it indicates the actuality, because He would not call actual that which was not, as if the events related only seemed to happen. For everything happened naturally and truly.' And further on: 'In no wise does divinity admit of suffering without a suffering body, nor of affliction and sorrow without a sorrowing and afflicted soul. Neither does it become troubled and pray without a mind which is troubled and prays. However, even though these things did not result from a defect of nature, they were done to show reality.' The words 'these things did not result from a defect of nature,' make it clear that He did not endure them involuntarily.

Chapter 24

Prayer is an ascent of the mind to God, or the asking God for things which are fitting. Then, how did the Lord pray in the matter of Lazarus, and at the time of His passion? For, since Christ is one and His sacred mind was once and

² *Against Apollinaris* 1.16; 2.13 (PG 26.1124A; 1153B).

³ John 12.27.

for all united hypostatically to God the Word, it neither needed to ascend to God nor to ask of God. It was, rather, that He appropriated our appearance and impressed what was ours upon Himself. He became a model for us, He taught us to ask of God and to lift ourselves up to Him, and through His sacred mind He opened the way for us to ascend to God. For, just as He endured the passions and gave us victory over them,¹ so also does He pray and open up for us, as I said, the way to the ascent to God. And so, also, does He for our sake fulfill all justice, as He said to John,² and reconcile His own Father to us and honor Him as principle and cause, thus showing Himself to be not adverse to God. Thus, in the matter of Lazarus, when He said: 'Father, I give thee thanks that thou hast heard me. And I knew that thou hearest me always; but because of the people who stand about have I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me,'³ was it not made quite plain to all that He had said this to show that He honored His own Father as His own cause and that He Himself was not adverse to God?⁴

When He said: 'Father, if it be possible, let this chalice pass from me. Nevertheless, not as I will but as thou wilt,'⁵ is it not clear to everyone⁶ that He is teaching us to ask help of God alone in times of trial and to put the divine will before our own, and that He is showing that He had truly made His own what is proper to our nature, and that He actually had two wills that are natural and correspond to His natures and are not mutually opposed? 'Father,' he says as being consubstantial, 'if it be possible,' not because He did not know⁷—and what is impossible for God?—but to instruct us to put the divine will before our own. For

1 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 30.14 (PG 36.121-122)

2 Cf. Matt. 3.15.

3 John 11.41,42.

4 Cf. John Chrysostom, *Homily 64 on John 2* (PG 59.355).

5 Matt. 26.39.

6 Cf. John Chrysostom, *Homily 83 on Matthew 1* (PG 58.746-747).

7 Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 30.12 (PG 36.117C).

this alone is impossible, namely, that which God does not wish and does not permit. 'Nevertheless, not as I will but as thou wilt,' He says as God, since He is of the same will as the Father, while at the same time He says it as man to show the natural will of His humanity, for this last naturally shrinks from death.

Now, the 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'⁸ He said because He had appropriated our appearance. For, unless by subtle imaginings a distinction should be made between what is seen and what is thought, God as His Father would not be called ours. Nor was He ever deserted by His divinity—on the contrary, it was ourselves who were left behind and overlooked. And so He appropriated our appearance and prayed these things.

Chapter 25

One should, moreover, know that there are two kinds of appropriation, the one being natural and substantial and the other apparent (προσωπική) and relative.¹ Now, the natural and substantial is that by which the Lord out of His love for man assumed both our nature and all that was natural to it, and in nature and in truth became man and experienced the things that are natural to man. It is apparent and relative, however, when one assumes the appearance (πρόσωπον) of another relatively, as out of pity or love, and in this other's stead speaks words in his behalf which in no way concern himself. It was by this last kind of appropriation that He appropriated our curse and dereliction and such things as are not according to nature, not because He was or had been such, but because He took on

⁸ Matt. 27.46.

¹ Maximus, *Solution of Difficulties of Theodore to Marinus* (PG 91. 220BC).

our appearance and was reckoned as one of us. And such is the sense of the words, 'being made a curse for us.'²

Chapter 26

God's Word Himself, then, endured all things in His flesh, while His divine nature, which alone is impassible, remained unaffected. For, when the one Christ made up of both divinity and humanity suffered, the passible part of Him suffered, because it was of its nature to suffer, but the impassible did not suffer with it. Thus, since the soul is passible, it does feel pain and suffer with the body when the body is hurt, although it itself is not hurt. The divinity, however, being impassible, does not suffer with the body.

And it should be known that, although we speak of God having suffered in the flesh, we by no means speak of the divinity suffering in the flesh or of God suffering through the flesh. For if, when the sun is shining upon a tree, the tree should be cut down by an axe, the sun will remain uncut and unaffected, then how much more will the impassible divinity of the Word hypostatically united with the flesh remain unaffected when the flesh suffers. And just as if one should pour water upon a red-hot iron, that which is naturally disposed to be affected by the water—the fire, I mean—will be quenched, while the iron remains unharmed, because it is not of its nature to be destroyed by the water; how much less did the divinity, which is alone impassible, endure the suffering of the flesh and still remain inseparable from it. Now, examples do not have to be absolutely and unfailingly exact, for, just because it is an example, one must find in it that which is like and that which is unlike. For likeness in everything would be identity and not an example, which is especially true with divine things. So, in the matter

² Gal. 3.13.

of theology and the Incarnation, it is impossible to find an absolutely perfect example.

Chapter 27

Since our Lord Jesus Christ was without sin, 'because he hath done no iniquity, he who taketh away the sin of the world, neither was there deceit in his mouth,'¹ He was not subject to death, even though death had by sin entered into the world.² And so for our sake He submits to death and dies and offers Himself to the Father as a sacrifice for us. For we had offended Him and it was necessary for Him to take upon Himself our redemption that we might thus be loosed from the condemnation—for God forbid that the Lord's blood should have been offered to the tyrant! Wherefore, then, death approaches, gulps down the bait of the body, and is pierced by the hook of the divinity. Then, having tasted of the sinless and life-giving body, it is destroyed and gives up all those whom it had swallowed down of old.³ For, just as the darkness entirely disappears when light is let in, so is destruction driven away at the onset of life, and life comes to all, while destruction comes to the destroyer.

And so, even though as man He did die and His sacred soul was separated from His immaculate body, the divinity remained unseparated from both—the soul, I mean, and the body. Thus, the one Person was not divided into two persons. For from the beginning both had existence in the same way in the Person of the Word, and when they were separated from each other in death, each one of them remained in the possession of the one Person of the Word. Hence, the one Person of the Word existed as person both of the Word and of the soul and of the body, for neither

¹ Isa. 53.9; John 1.29.

² Cf. Rom. 5.12.

³ Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *Catecheses* 24 (PG 45.65A).

the soul nor the body ever had any person of its own other than that of the Word, and the Person of the Word was always one and never two. Hence, the Person of Christ was always one, since, even though the soul was separated from the body in place, it still was hypostatically united to it through the Word.

Chapter 28

The word *destruction* (φθορά) has two meanings.¹ Thus, it means human sufferings such as hunger, thirst, weariness, piercing with nails, death—that is separation of the soul from the body—and the like. In this sense, we say that the Lord's body was destructible, because He endured all these things freely. Destruction, however, also means the complete dissolution of the body and its reduction to the elements of which it was composed. By many this is more generally called *corruption* (διαφθορά). This the Lord's body did not experience, as the Prophet David says: 'Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; nor wilt thou give thy holy one to corruption.'²

Therefore, it is impious to say with the insane Julian and Gaianus that before the resurrection the Lord's body was indestructible in the first sense. For, if it was thus incorruptible, then it was not consubstantial with us, and the things such as the hunger, the thirst, the nails, the piercing of the side, and death which the Gospel says happened did not really happen, but only seemed to. But, if they only seemed to happen, then the mystery of the Incarnation is a hoax and a stage trick; it was in appearance and not in truth that He was made man and in appearance and not in truth that we have been saved. But far be it, and let those who say this have no part of salvation.³ We, however,

1 Cf. Leontius, *On Sects* 10 (PG 86.1260-1261).

2 Ps. 15.10.

3 Cf. Anastasius Sin., *The Guide* 23 (PG 89.300BD).

have gained and shall obtain the true salvation. Moreover, in the second sense of the word destruction, we confess that the Lord's body was indestructible, that is to say, incorruptible, even as has been handed down to us by the inspired Fathers. Nevertheless, we do say that after the Saviour's resurrection the body of the Lord is indestructible in the first sense, too. And through His body the Lord has granted the resurrection and consequent incorruptibility to our body, also, Himself becoming to us the first fruits of the resurrection and incorruptibility and impassibility.⁴ 'For this corruptible must put on incorruption,' says the divine Apostle.⁵

Chapter 29

The deified soul went down into hell so that, just as the Sun of Justice rose upon those on earth,¹ so also might the light shine upon them under the earth who were sitting in darkness and the shadow of death;² so that, just as He had brought the good news of peace to those on earth, so also might He bring that of deliverance to captives and that of sight to the blind.³ And to them that believed He became a cause of eternal salvation, while to them that had not He became a refutation of unbelief, and so also to them in hell,⁴ 'That to him every knee should bow, of those that are in heaven, on earth, and under the earth.'⁵ And thus, having loosed them that had been bound for ages, He came back again from the dead and made the resurrection possible for us.

⁴ Cf. 1 Cor. 15.20.

⁵ Cor. 15.53.

¹ Cf. Mal. 4.2.

² Cf. Isa. 9.2.

³ Cf. Luke 4.19.

⁴ Cf. 1 Pet. 3.19.

⁵ Phil. 2.10.

BOOK FOUR

Chapter 1



AFTER HIS RESURRECTION from the dead He put aside all His passions, that is to say, ruin, hunger and thirst, sleep and fatigue, and the like. For, even though He did taste food after His resurrection,¹ it was not in obedience to any law of nature, because He did not feel hunger, but by way of dispensation that He might confirm the truth of the resurrection by showing that the flesh which had suffered and that which had risen were the same. Moreover, He did not put aside any of the elements of His nature, neither body nor soul, but kept possession of the body and the rational, intellectual, willing and acting soul. And thus He sits at the right hand of the Father and wills our salvation both as God and as man. And, while He acts as God by working the providence, preservation, and government of all things, He acts as man in remembering His labors on earth and in seeing and knowing that He is adored by all rational creation. For His sacred soul knows that it is hypostatically united to God the Word and that it is adored not as an ordinary soul, but as the soul of God. And both the ascent from earth into heaven and the descending again are actions of a circumscribed body, for 'he shall so come to you,' it is said, 'as you have seen him going into heaven.'²

¹ Cf. Luke 24.43.

² Acts 1.11.

Chapter 2

Now, we say that Christ sat in His body at the right hand of the Father, yet we do not mean a physical right hand of the Father. For how would He who is uncircumscribed have a physical right hand? Right and left hands belong to those who are circumscribed. What we call the right hand of the Father is the glory and honor of the Godhead in which the Son of God existed as God and consubstantial with the Father before the ages and in which, having in the last days become incarnate, He sits corporeally with His flesh glorified together with Him, for He and His flesh are adored together with one adoration by all creation.¹

Chapter 3

Together with the Father and the Holy Ghost we adore the Son of God, Him who was bodiless before the Incarnation, whereas the same is now become incarnate and has been made man while at the same time remaining God. Now, should you by subtle reasonings distinguish what is seen from what is thought, then according to its own nature His flesh is not adorable, in so far as it is created.¹ When, however, it has been united with God the Word, it is adorable because of Him and in Him. In the same way, a king is revered whether or not he be robed; and the purple robe, when it is just a purple robe, is trod upon and tossed about, but when it has become a royal vestment it is esteemed and held in honor, and should anyone treat it with contempt, he will most likely be condemned to death. And again, it is not impossible to touch an ordinary piece of wood, but,

¹ Cf. Basil, *On the Holy Ghost* 6.15 (PG 32.89.92).

¹ Cf. Athanasius, *Against Apollinaris* 1.6 (PG 26.1106C); *Epistle to Adelphius* (PG 26.1073D-1076A); Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 51 (PG 43.105).

after it has been exposed to fire and become a burning coal, it becomes impossible to touch, not because of itself but because of the fire combined with it. And it is not the nature of the wood which is untouchable, but the coal, that is to say, the burning wood. In the same way, the flesh is not of its own nature adorable, but in the incarnate Word of God it is so; not because of itself, but because of the Word of God hypostatically united to it. Neither do we say that we adore ordinary flesh, but the flesh of God, that is to say, God incarnate.

Chapter 4

The Father is Father and not Son.¹ The Son is Son and not Father. The Holy Ghost is Spirit and neither Father nor Son. This is so because that which is a property is unalterable; else, how would it be a property were it to be altered and changed? For this reason the Son of God becomes Son of Man, namely, that His peculiar property may remain unaltered. For, while He was Son of God, He was incarnate of the holy Virgin and became Son of Man without giving up His property of filiation.

The Son of God became man in order that He might again grace man as He had when He made him. For He had made him to His own image, understanding and free, and to His own likeness, that is to say, as perfect in virtues as it was possible for human nature to be, for these virtues are, as it were, characteristics of the divine nature—freedom from care and annoyance, integrity, goodness, wisdom, justice, freedom from all vice. Thus, He put man in communion with Himself and through this communion with Himself raised him to incorruptibility, 'for He created man incorruptible.'² But, since by transgressing the commandment we obscured and canceled out the characteristics of the divine

¹ Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 39.12 (PG 36.348B).

² Wisd. 2.23.

image, we were given over to evil and stripped of the divine communion. 'For what fellowship hath light with darkness?'³ Then, since we had been removed from life, we fell subject to the destruction of death. But, since He had shared with us what was better and we had not kept it, He now takes His share of what is worse, of our nature I mean to say, that through Himself and in Himself He may restore what was to His image and what to His likeness, while also teaching us the virtuous way of life which He has made easy of ascent for us through Him, and that, having become the first fruits of our resurrection, He may by the communication of life free us from death and restore the useless and worn-out vessel, and so that, having called us to the knowledge of God, He may redeem us from the tyranny of the Devil and by patience and humility teach us to overthrow the tyrant.

Indeed, the worship of demons has ceased. Creation has been sanctified with the divine blood. Altars and temples of idols have been overthrown. Knowledge of God has been implanted. The consubstantial Trinity, the uncreated Godhead is worshiped, one true God, Creator and Lord of all. Virtue is practiced. Hope of the resurrection has been granted through the resurrection of Christ. The demons tremble at the men who were formerly in their power. Yes, and most wonderful of all is that all these things were successfully brought about through a cross and suffering and death. The Gospel of the knowledge of God has been preached to the whole world and has put the adversaries to flight not by war and arms and camps. Rather, it was a few unarmed, poor, unlettered, persecuted, tormented, done-to-death men, who, by preaching One who had died crucified in the flesh, prevailed over the wise and powerful, because the almighty power of the Crucified was with them. That death which was once so terrible has been defeated and He who was once despised and hated is now preferred before life. These are

3 2 Cor. 6.14.

the successes consequent upon the advent of the Christ; these are the signs of His power. For it was not as when through Moses He divided the sea and brought one people safely through out of Egypt and the bondage of Pharaoh. Rather, He delivered all humanity from death's destruction and the tyrant that was sin. It was not by force that He led sinners to virtue, not by having them swallowed up by the earth, nor by having them burnt up by fire, nor by ordering them stoned to death;⁴ it was with gentleness and forbearance that He persuaded men to choose virtue and for virtue's sake to undergo sufferings with rejoicing. Sinners were formerly tormented, yet they clung to their sin, and sin was accounted a god by them; but now, for piety and virtue's sake, they choose torments, tortures, and death.

Well done, O Christ, O Wisdom and Power and Word of God, and God almighty! What should we resourceless people give Thee in return for all things? For all things are Thine and Thou askest nothing of us but that we be saved. Even this Thou hast given us, and by Thy ineffable goodness Thou art grateful to those who accept it. Thanks be to Thee who hast given being and the grace of well-being and who by Thy ineffable condescension hast brought back to this state those who fell from it.

Chapter 5

Before the Incarnation, the Person of God the Word was simple and uncompounded, bodiless and uncreated. But when it had assumed flesh, it became person to the flesh also, and it became compounded of the divinity, which it always had, and the flesh, which it took on in addition. Being thus found in two natures, it bears the properties of the two, so that the same one person is at once uncreated in its divinity and created in its humanity, both visible and invisible. Otherwise, we are obliged either to divide the one Christ and

⁴ Cf. Num. 16.31-33.35: Lev. 20.2.

say that there are two persons, or to deny the difference of the natures and thus introduce change and mingling.

Chapter 6

Not as some falsely hold was the mind united to God the Word before the taking on of flesh from the Virgin and from that time called Christ. This absurdity results from the nonsense of Origen's teaching of the pre-existence of souls.¹ We say that the Son and Word of God became Christ the instant that He came to dwell in the womb of the holy Ever-Virgin and was made flesh without undergoing change, the instant that the flesh was anointed with the divinity. For, as Gregory the Theologian says, there was such an anointing.² Likewise, the most holy Cyril of Alexandria, in writing to Emperor Theodosius, said as follows: 'I say that neither the Word of God as distinct from the humanity, nor the temple born of woman as not united to the Word, may be called Christ Jesus. The Word which is from God is considered to be Christ when ineffably brought together with the humanity in the union of the dispensation.'³ And to the empresses he writes thus:⁴ 'There are some who say that the name Christ properly belongs to the Word only as considered in Himself as existing begotten of God the Father. But we have not been taught to think or talk in that way, because it is when the Word was made flesh that we say that He received the name of Christ Jesus. For, since He was anointed with the oil of gladness,⁵ that is to say, anointed with the Spirit by God the Father, for this reason is He called Christ, or Anointed. That the anointing was of the humanity no right minded person would doubt.' And the

1 Cf. *De principiis* 2.9.6 (PG 11.230 et al.).

2 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 30.21 (PG 36.132B).

3 Cyril of Alexandria, *To Emperor Theodosius* 28 (PG 76.1173C).

4 *Ibid.*, *To the Empresses* 13 (PG 76.1220CD).

5 Cf. Ps. 44.8; Heb. 1.9.

renowned Athanasius says to this effect, somewhere in his discourse on the saving coming of Christ: 'God (the Word) as existing before coming to dwell in the flesh was not man but God with God, being invisible and impassible. But, when He became man, He took the name Christ, because the passion and death are consequent upon this name.'⁶

Now, even though sacred Scripture does say: 'Therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness,' one must know that sacred Scripture frequently uses the past tense for the future, as, for example: 'Afterwards, he was seen upon earth and conversed with men,'⁷ for God had not yet been seen by man nor had conversed with them when this was said. And again: 'Upon the rivers of Babylon, there we sat and wept,'⁸ for these things had not yet taken place.

Chapter 7

*Αγέννητον and γενητόν, written with one ν, belong to nature and mean 'uncreated' and 'created.'¹ On the other hand, ἀγέννητον and γεννητόν—that is to say 'unbegotten' and 'begotten'—being spelled with two ν's, belong not to nature, but to person. Thus, the divine nature is ἀγέννητος, that is to say, uncreated, whereas all things except the divine nature are γενητά, that is to say, created. Now, in the divine and uncreated nature the unbegotten is found in the Father, for He was not begotten, whereas the begotten is found in the Son, since He is eternally begotten of the Father, and the procession is found in the Holy Ghost. Moreover, the first individuals of every species of living beings were unbegotten but not uncreated, because they were made by

6 Athanasius, *Against Apollinaris* 2.1-2 (PG 26.1133B).

7 Bar. 3.38.

8 Ps. 136.1.

1 Cf. above, Book I, ch. 8.

the Creator and not begotten of their kind. For, while γένησις is creation, γέννησις with God is the proceeding of the consubstantial Son from the Father alone, and with human beings the proceeding of a consubstantial person from the conjunction of male and female. Thus, we know that to be begotten belongs not to nature, but to person, for, if it did belong to nature, we should not find the begotten and the unbegotten in the same nature. So, the holy Mother of God engendered a Person who is known in two natures and who in His divinity was timelessly begotten of the Father, but who in the last days became incarnate of her and was born in the flesh.

Now, should they who are inquiring intimate that He who was begotten of the holy Mother of God is two natures, we shall say: Certainly He is two natures, for the same is both God and man. It is the same way with the crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension, too, because these things do not belong to nature, but person. Therefore, Christ, while being two natures, suffered in His passible nature and in it was crucified, for it was in the flesh that He hung on the cross, and not in the divinity. Should they say, while inquiring of us: Did two natures die? We shall reply: No, indeed. Therefore, two natures were not crucified either, but the Christ was begotten, that is to say, the Divine Word was incarnate and begotten in the flesh, and He was crucified in the flesh, suffered in the flesh, and died in the flesh, while His divinity remained unaffected.

Chapter 8

He who has been born first is first-born, whether he is the only child or has preceded other brothers. So, if the Son of God were called 'first-born' without being called 'only-begotten,' then we should understand Him to be first-born of creatures as being a creature.¹ Since, however, He is called

¹ Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *Against Eunomius* 4.3 (PG 45.636-637).

both first-born and only-begotten, we must maintain both of these as applying to Him. Thus, we say that He is 'the first-born of every creature,'² since He is from God, and creation is also from God. But, since He alone is begotten timelessly of the substance of God the Father, He has fittingly been called the only-begotten and first-born Son, and not first-created, since creation is not of the substance of the Father, but has been brought by His will from nothing into being.³ He is, moreover, 'first-born amongst many brethren,'⁴ for, while He was only-begotten, He was also born of a mother. For this very reason, that He shared flesh and blood along with us and then, also, that we were made sons of God through Him by being adopted through baptism, He who is by nature Son of God has become first-born among us who have by adoption and grace become sons of God and are accounted as His brethren. This is why He said: 'I ascend to my Father and to your Father.'⁵ He did not say 'our Father', but 'my Father,' that is to say, by nature, and 'your Father', by grace. And He said 'my God and your God,' and He did not say 'our God,' but 'my God.' And should you by subtle reasonings distinguish what is seen from what is thought, then it is as Creator and Lord that He said 'your God.'

Chapter 9

We confess one baptism unto remission of sins and life everlasting. For baptism shows the death of the Lord.¹ Indeed, through baptism we are buried with the Lord, as the divine Apostle says.² Therefore, just as the death of the Lord happened but once, so is it necessary to be baptized but once. It is

2 Col. 1.15.

3 Cf. Athanasius, *Ecthesis* 3 (PG 25.204-205).

4 Rom. 8.29.

5 John 20.17.

1 Cf. Rom. 6.3.

2 Cf. Col. 2.12.

further necessary, in accordance with the Lord's word,³ to be baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost and thus to learn to confess Father and Son and Holy Ghost. Consequently, all those who have been baptized in the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost and have thus been taught the one nature of the Godhead in three Persons, but who are baptized over again, these crucify the Christ again, as the divine Apostle says: 'For it is impossible for those who were once illuminated,' and so forth, 'to be renewed again to penance, crucifying again to themselves the Christ and making him a mockery.'⁴ All those, however, who have not been baptized in the Holy Trinity must be baptized again. For, even though the divine Apostle says that 'we have been baptized in Christ and in his death,'⁵ he does not mean that the baptismal invocation should be made thus, but that baptism is a figure of Christ's death. Indeed, by the three immersions baptism signifies the three days of the Lord's burial. Therefore, being 'baptized in Christ' merely means believing in Him and being baptized. Besides, it is impossible to believe in Christ without having been taught to confess the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost. For Christ is the Son of the living God, whom the Father anointed with the Holy Ghost,⁶ as the divine David says: 'Therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows,'⁷ and Isaias, speaking in the name of the Lord: 'The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me.'⁸ Indeed, it was to teach His own disciples the invocation that He said, 'Baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.'⁹ For God had created us for immortality,¹⁰ but, since we disobeyed

³ Cf. Matt. 28.19.

⁴ Heb. 6.4-6.

⁵ Rom. 6.3.

⁶ Cf. Matt. 16.16; Acts 10.38.

⁷ Ps. 44.8.

⁸ Isa. 61.1.

⁹ Matt. 28.19.

¹⁰ Cf. Methodius, *On the Resurrection* (PG 18.268C).

His saving commandment, He condemned us to the destruction of death in order that what was evil might not be immortal. But because He is compassionate, He condescended to His servants and, becoming like us, redeemed us from destruction by His own suffering. He made a fountain of forgiveness gush out for us from His sacred and immaculate side,¹¹ both water unto regeneration and the washing away of sin and destruction, and blood as drink productive of life everlasting. Moreover, He has given us a commandment to be born again of water and the Spirit,¹² with the Holy Ghost coming upon the water through prayer and invocation. For, since man is twofold,¹³ being of body and soul, the purification He gave us is also twofold, through water and the Spirit, with the Spirit renewing in us what is to His image and likeness and the water by the grace of the Spirit purifying the body from sin and delivering it from destruction—the water completing the figure of the death and the Spirit producing the guarantee of life.

For from the beginning 'the spirit of God moved over the waters',¹⁴ and over and again Scripture testifies to the fact that water is purifying.¹⁵ It was with water that God washed away the sin of the world in the time of Noe.¹⁶ It was with water that every one who was unclean was purified in accordance with the Law, and even their garments were washed with water.¹⁷ By burning up the holocaust with water Elias showed that the grace of the Spirit was mixed with the water.¹⁸ And in accordance with the Law almost everything was purified with water, for the things which are perceptible to the eye are symbols of those which are perceptible to the mind. Indeed, it is in the soul that the regeneration is brought

11 Cf. John 19.34.

12 Cf. John 3.5.

13 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 40.8 (PG 36.368A).

14 Gen. 1.2.

15 Cf. Lev. 15.

16 Cf. Gen. 6.17.

17 Cf. Lev. 15.

18 Cf. 3 Kings 18.34,38.

about. Even though we be creatures, faith is capable of making us to be adopted through the Spirit and brought to our former state of blessedness.

By baptism, then, remission of sins is granted to all alike, but the grace of the Spirit is granted in proportion to the faith and the previous purification. Now, therefore, we receive the first fruits of the Holy Ghost through baptism, and this rebirth becomes the beginning of another life for us, a seal, a safeguard and an illumination.

It is furthermore necessary for us to make every effort to keep ourselves pure from filthy works, lest we return like the dog to his vomit¹⁹ and once more make ourselves slaves to sin. For faith without works is dead; so, likewise, are works without faith, because true faith is proved by works.²⁰

What is more, we are baptized in the Holy Trinity because the things that are baptized have need of the Holy Trinity for their preservation and permanence, and the three Persons cannot but be present together with each other, for the Holy Trinity is indivisible.

A first baptism was that of the flood unto the cutting away of sin. A second was that by the sea and the cloud,²¹ for the cloud is a symbol of the Spirit, while the sea is a symbol of the water. A third is that of the Law, for every unclean person washed himself with water and also washed his garments and thus entered into the camp.²² A fourth is that of John, which was an introductory baptism leading those thus baptized to penance,²³ so that they might believe in Christ. 'I indeed,' he says, 'baptize you in water: but he that shall come after me he shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost and fire.'²⁴ Thus, John purified with water in advance to prepare for the Spirit. A fifth is the Lord's baptism with which He Himself was bap-

19 Cf. 2 Pet. 2.22; Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 39.14 (PG 36.352A).

20 Cf. James 2.22,26.

21 Cf. 1 Cor. 10.2; Gregory Nazianzen, *op. cit.* 17 (PG 36.353C).

22 Cf. Lev. 14.8.

23 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *loc. cit.*

24 Matt. 3.11.

tized. He, however, was baptized not that He Himself stood in any need of purification but that by making my purification His own He might 'crush the heads of the dragons in the waters,'²⁵ wash away the sin and bury all of the old Adam in the water, sanctify the Baptist, fulfill the Law, reveal the mystery of the Trinity, and become for us a model and example for the reception of baptism. And we, too, are baptized with the perfect baptism of the Lord, which is by water and the Spirit. Christ is said to baptize in fire, because He poured out the grace of the Spirit upon the holy Apostles in the form of tongues of fire, as the Lord Himself says: 'John indeed baptized with water; but you shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost and fire, not many days hence.'²⁶ Or it is because of the chastising baptism of the fire to come that He is said to baptize with fire. A sixth is that which is by penance and tears and which is truly painful.²⁷ A seventh is that which is by blood and martyrdom.²⁸ Christ Himself was also baptized with this for our sake.²⁹ It is exceedingly sublime and blessed in so far as it is not sullied by second stains. An eighth, which is the last, is not saving, but, while being destructive of evil, since evil and sin no longer hold sway, it chastises endlessly.

The Holy Ghost came down in bodily form as a dove to intimate the first fruits of our baptism and to give honor to His body, because it, that is to say, His body, was through its deification God.³⁰ And it was also because, earlier, it once was a dove that brought the good news of the cessation of the flood. And the Holy Ghost descended upon the holy Apostles in the form of fire, because He is God, and 'God is a consuming fire.'³¹

25 Ps. 73.13.

26 Acts 1.5.

27 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *op. cit.* (PG 36.356A).

28 Cf. *Ibid.*

29 Cf. Luke 12.50.

30 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *op. cit.* 16 (PG 36.353B).

31 Cf. Deut. 4.24; Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 41.12 (PG 36.445A).

Oil is used at baptism to show our anointing and to make us Christs. It is also to proclaim God's mercy upon us through Holy Ghost, since the dove had also carried an olive branch to those who had been delivered from the flood.³²

John was baptized when he placed his hand upon the divine head of the Lord. He was also baptized in his own blood.

When the faith of the candidates has been testified to by works, baptism should not be deferred.³³ Should, however, a candidate receive baptism fraudulently, he will be condemned rather than helped.

Chapter 10

Faith, indeed, is of two kinds. Thus, 'faith cometh by hearing,'¹ for, when we hear the sacred Scriptures, we believe in the teaching of the Holy Ghost. And this faith is made perfect by all those things which Christ has ordained; it believes truly, it is devout, and it keeps the commandments of Him who has renewed us. For he who does not believe in accordance with the tradition of the Catholic Church or who through untoward works holds communion with the Devil is without faith.

Then again, there is a faith 'which is the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things that appear not.'² This is an undoubting and unquestioning hope both for the things promised us by God and for the success of our petitions. The first kind of faith comes from our faculty of judgment (γνώμη), whereas the second is one of the gifts of the Spirit.

Furthermore, one must know that by baptism we are cir-

32 Cf. Gen. 8.11. There is a sort of pun here, inasmuch as the Greek word for 'mercy' very closely resembles that for 'olive tree.'

33 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 40.11 (PG 36.372).

1 Rom. 10.17.

2 Heb. 11.1.

cumcised of the entire covering which we have borne from birth, sin that is, and become spiritual Israelites and a people of God.

Chapter 11

'The word of the cross, to them indeed that perish, is foolishness; but to them that are saved, that is, to us, it is the power of God.'¹ For 'the spiritual man judgeth all things, but the sensual man perceiveth not these things that are of the Spirit.'² For they are foolishness to such as do not receive them in faith and conclude to the goodness and omnipotence of God, but by human and natural reasoning inquire into divine things. For all the things of God are above the natural order and beyond speech and understanding. And should one consider how and why God brought all things from nothing into being and should he try to arrive at this by natural reasoning, he will not succeed. For such knowledge is sensual and devilish.³ If, however, one is guided by faith and concludes to the goodness, omnipotence, truth, wisdom, and justice of the Godhead, then he will find all things to be smooth and even and the road straight. Without faith it is impossible to be saved,⁴ since by faith all things endure, both human and spiritual. For a farmer does not plow a furrow in the earth without faith, nor a merchant entrust his life to a bit of wood on the raging high seas. Neither are marriages contracted nor anything else in life done without faith. By faith we understand that all things have been brought from nothing into being by the power of God, and by faith we prosper in all things, both human and divine. Faith is, moreover, an assent devoid of all curiosity.

Every action of Christ and all His working of miracles

¹ 1 Cor. 1.18.

² 1 Cor. 2.15,14.

³ Cf. James 3.15.

⁴ Cf. Heb. 11.6.

were truly very great and divine and wonderful, but of all things the most wonderful is His honorable cross. For by nothing else except the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ has death been brought low, the sin of our first parent destroyed, hell plundered, resurrection bestowed, the power given us to despise the things of this world and even death itself, the road back to the former blessedness made smooth, the gates of paradise opened, our nature seated at the right hand of God, and we made children and heirs of God. By the cross all things have been set aright. 'For all we who are baptized in Christ,' says the Apostle, 'are baptized in his death' and 'as many of us as have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ'; moreover, 'Christ is the power and wisdom of God.'⁵ See how the death of Christ, the cross, that is to say, has clothed us with the subsistent wisdom and power of God! And the word of the Cross is the power of God, whether because by it God's might, His victory over death, that is, was manifested to us, or because, just as the four arms of the cross are made solid and bound together by their central part, so are the height and the depth, the length and the breadth, that is to say, all creation both visible and invisible, held together by the power of God.

This we have been given as a sign on our forehead, just as Israel was given the circumcision, for by it we faithful are set apart from the infidels and recognized. It is a shield and armor and a trophy against the Devil. It is a seal that the Destroyer may not strike us, as Scripture says.⁶ It is a raising up for those who lie fallen, a support for those who stand, a staff for the infirm, a crook for the shepherded, a guide for the wandering, a perfecting of the advanced, salvation for soul and body, an averter of all evils, a cause of all good things, a destruction of sin, a plant of resurrection, and a tree of eternal life.

So, then, that honorable and most truly venerable tree

⁵ Rom. 6.3; Gal. 3.27; 1 Cor. 1.24.

⁶ Cf. Exod. 12.23.

upon which Christ offered Himself as a sacrifice for us is itself to be adored, because it has been sanctified by contact with the sacred body and blood. So also are the nails, the lance, the garments, and such sacred resting places of His as the manger, the cave, saving Golgotha, the life-giving tomb, Sion the citadel of the churches, and others. Thus, David the forefather of God says: 'We will go into his tabernacle: we will adore in the place where his feet stood,' and that he means the cross is evident from what follows: 'Arise, O Lord, into thy resting place'⁷—for the resurrection follows after the cross. Now, if the house, the bed, and the clothing of our loved ones are dear to us, then how much more the things of our God and Saviour by which we also have been saved!

And we also adore the likeness of the honorable and life-giving cross, even though it be made of another material, not that we honor the material—God forbid!—but the likeness as a symbol of Christ. Thus, when He explained to His disciples saying: 'Then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven,'⁸ He meant the cross. For this reason, also, the angel of the resurrection said to the women: 'You seek Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified.'⁹ Likewise, the Apostle: 'But we preach Christ crucified.'¹⁰ Now, there are many Christs and Jesuses, but only one Crucified, and he did not say 'pierced by a lance' but 'crucified.' Therefore, the sign of Christ is to be adored, for, wherever the sign may be, there He, too, will be. If, however, the form should happen to be destroyed, the material of which the likeness of the cross was composed is not to be adored, even though it be gold or precious stones. Thus, we adore everything that has reference to God, although it is to Him that we direct the worship.

7 Ps. 131.7,8.

8 Matt. 24.30.

9 Mark 16.6.

10 1 Cor. 1.23.

The tree of life which was planted by God in paradise prefigured this honorable Cross, for, since death came by a tree, it was necessary for life and the resurrection to be bestowed by a tree. It was Jacob who first prefigured the cross, when he adored the top of the rod of Joseph.¹¹ And when he blessed Joseph's sons with his hands crossed,¹² he most clearly described the sign of the cross. [Then there were] the rod of Moses which smote the sea with the form of a cross and saved Israel while causing Pharaoh to be swallowed up; his hands stretched out in the form of a cross and putting Amalec to flight; the bitter water being made sweet by a tree, and the rock being struck and gushing forth streams of water;¹³ the rod of Aaron miraculously confirming the dignity of the priesthood; a serpent raised in triumph upon a tree, as if dead, with the tree preserving those who with faith beheld the dead enemy,¹⁴ even as Christ was nailed up in flesh of sin but which had not known sin; great Moses calling out: 'You will see your life hanging before your eyes on a tree';¹⁵ and Isaias: 'I have spread forth my hands all day to an unbelieving and contradictory people.'¹⁶ May we who adore this attain to the portion of Christ the crucified. Amen.

Chapter 12

It is not without any reason or by chance that we worship toward the east. On the contrary, since we are composed of a visible and an invisible nature, of an intellectual nature and a sensitive one, that is, we also offer a twofold worship to the Creator. It is just as we also sing both with our mind and with our bodily lips, and as we are baptized both in

11 Cf. Heb. 11.21; Gen. 47.31 (Septuagint).

12 Cf. Gen. 48.13-15.

13 Cf. Exod. 14.16ff.; 17.11ff.; 15.25; 17.6.

14 Cf. Num. 17.8; 21.9.

15 Deut. 28.66 (Septuagint, except for the phrase 'on a tree').

16 Isa. 65.2 (Septuagint).

water and in the Spirit, and as we are united to the Lord in two ways when we receive the sacrament and the grace of the Spirit.

And so, since God is spiritual light¹ and Christ in sacred Scripture is called 'Sun of Justice' and 'Orient,'² the East should be dedicated to His worship. For everything beautiful should be dedicated to God from whom everything that is good receives its goodness. Also, the divine David says: 'Sing to God, ye kingdoms of the earth: sing ye to the Lord; who mounteth above the heaven of heavens, to the east.'³ And still again, Scripture says: 'And the Lord had planted a paradise in Eden to the east; wherein he placed man whom he had formed,' and whom He cast out, when He had transgressed, 'and made him to live over against the paradise of pleasure,'⁴ or in the west. Thus it is that, when we worship God, we long for our ancient fatherland and gaze toward it. The tabernacle of Moses had the veil and the propitiatory to the east; and the tribe of Juda, as being the more honorable, pitched their tents on the east; and in the celebrated temple of Solomon the gate of the Lord was set to the east.⁵ As a matter of fact, when the Lord was crucified, He looked toward the west, and so we worship gazing towards Him. And when he was taken up, He ascended to the east and thus the Apostles worshiped Him and thus He shall come in the same way as they had seen Him going into heaven,⁶ as the Lord Himself said: 'As lightning cometh out of the east and appeareth even into the west: so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.'⁷ And so, while we are awaiting Him, we worship toward the east. This is, moreover, the unwritten

1 Cf. 1 John 1.5.

2 Cf. Mal. 4.2; Zach. 3.8; Luke 1.78.

3 Ps. 67.33,34.

4 Gen. 2.8; 3.24 (Septuagint).

5 Cf. Lev. 16.14; Num. 2.3; Ezech. 44.1-2.

6 Cf. Acts 1.11.

7 Matt. 24.27.

tradition of the Apostles, for they have handed many things down to us unwritten.⁸

Chapter 13

Because of the exceedingly great wealth of His goodness, the good, all-good, and exceedingly good God, who is all goodness, did not rest content that the Good, or His nature, should just be and not be shared by anything.¹ For this reason, He first made the spiritual and heavenly powers, and then the visible and sensible world, and then, finally, man of the spiritual and the sensible. Hence, all things He has made participate in His goodness by the fact that they have being. For He is being to them all, since 'in him are all things,'² not only because He has brought them from nothing into being, but because it is by His operation that all things He made are kept in existence and held together. Living things, however, participate more abundantly, because they participate in the good both by their being and by their living. But rational beings, while they participate in the good in the aforementioned ways, do so still more by their very rationality. For they are in a way more akin to Him, even though He is, of course, immeasurably superior.

Since man was made both rational and free, he received the power to be unceasingly united to God by his own choice, provided, of course, that he persevere in the good, that is to say, in obedience to his Creator. Then, when man became disobedient to the commandment of Him who had made him and thus became subject to death and corruption, the Maker and Creator of our kind, through the bowels of His mercy, likened Himself to us and became man in all things

8 Cf. Basil, *On the Holy Ghost* 27.66 (PG 32.188A).

1 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 45.5 (PG 36.629A).

2 Rom. 11.36.

except sin and was united to our nature. Thus, because we did not keep what He had imparted to us, His own image and His own spirit, He now participates in our poor weak nature so that He may render us pure and incorrupt and make us once more participators in His divinity.

It was moreover, necessary not only for the first fruits of our nature, but also for every man who so wished. And it was necessary that every such man should be born with a second birth and nourished with a new food fit for the new birth, and thus attain to the measure of perfection. Hence, by His own birth, or incarnation, and by His baptism and passion and resurrection, He freed our nature from the sin of our first parent, from death and corruption. And He became the first-fruit of the resurrection and set Himself to be a way, a model, and an example, so that we, too, might follow in His footsteps and become by adoption, as He is by nature, sons and heirs of God and joint heirs together with Him.³ Thus, He gave us, as I have said, a second birth, so that, as we had been born of Adam and had been likened to him and had become heir to his curse and corruption, we might by being born anew of Him be likened to Him and become heir to His incorruption and blessing and glory.

Now, since this Adam is spiritual, it was necessary that there be a spiritual birth and also a spiritual food. But, since we are individuals of a twofold nature and compounded, it is necessary that the birth also be of a twofold nature and that the food likewise be compounded. Hence, the birth was given us by water and the Spirit, by holy baptism, I mean, while the food was the Bread of Life itself, our Lord Jesus Christ who had come down from heaven.⁴ For, when He was about to suffer death freely for our sake, on the night in which He delivered Himself up, He made a new testament

³ Cf. Rom. 8.17.

⁴ Cf. John 6.48.

for His holy disciples and Apostles and, through them, for all that believe in Him. So, when He had eaten the old Pasch with His disciples in the upper chamber on holy and glorious Mount Sion and had fulfilled the old testament, He washed the feet of His disciples and thus showed a symbol of holy baptism.⁵ Then, after He had broken bread, He gave it to them saying: 'Take ye and eat. This is my body, which is broken for you unto remission of sins.'⁶ And in like manner He took also the chalice of wine and water and gave it to them, saying: 'Drink ye all of this. This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for you unto remission of sins. This do in commemoration of me. For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink this chalice, you shall show the death of the Son of man and confess his resurrection, until he come.'⁷

If, then, 'the word of the Lord is living and effectual',⁸ and if 'whatsoever the Lord pleased he hath done';⁹ if He said: 'Be light made, and it was made. Be a firmament made, and it was made';¹⁰ if by the word of the Lord the heavens were established, and all the power of them by the spirit of his mouth';¹¹ if heaven and earth, water and fire, and air and the whole universe of these were made perfect by the word of the Lord, and this much famed living being, too, which is man; if by His will God the Word Himself became man and without seed caused the pure and undefiled blood of the blessed Ever-Virgin to form a body for Himself;—if all this, then can He not make the bread His body and the wine and water His blood? In the beginning He said: 'Let

⁵ Cf. John 13.1-15.

⁶ Cf. 1 Cor. 11.24. The 'which is broken for you' is not strictly Scriptural but belongs to the most ancient liturgical tradition and still survives in most eastern Liturgies.

⁷ Cf. 1 Cor. 11.25-26. This form, as well as that of the consecration of the bread just mentioned, is the form of the Liturgy of St. James which was commonly used in Syria and Palestine.

⁸ Heb. 4.12.

⁹ Ps. 134.6.

¹⁰ Gen. 1.3,6.

¹¹ Ps. 32.6.

the earth bring forth the green herb,¹² and even until now, when the rain falls, the earth brings forth its own shoots under the influence and power of the divine command. God said: 'This is my body,' and, 'This is my blood,' and, 'This do in commemoration of me,' and by His almighty command it is done, until He shall come, for what He said was 'until he come.' And through the invocation the overshadowing power of the Holy Ghost becomes a rainfall for this new cultivation. For, just as all things whatsoever God made He made by the operation of the Holy Ghost, so also it is by the operation of the Spirit that these things are done which surpass nature and cannot be discerned except by faith alone. 'How shall this be done to me,' asked the blessed Virgin, because I know not man?' The archangel Gabriel answered, 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee.'¹³ And now you ask how the bread becomes the body of Christ and the wine and water the blood of Christ. And I tell you that the Holy Ghost comes down and works these things which are beyond description and understanding.

Now, bread and wine are used¹⁴ because God knows human weakness and how most things that are not constantly and habitually used cannot be put up with and are shunned. With His usual condescension, therefore, He does through the ordinary things of nature those which surpass the natural order. And just as in the case of baptism, because it is the custom of men to wash themselves with water and anoint themselves with oil He joined the grace of the Spirit to oil and water and made it a laver of regeneration, so, because it is men's custom to eat bread and drink water and wine He joined His divinity to these and made them His body and blood, so that by the ordinary natural things we might be raised to those which surpass the order of nature.

¹² Gen. 1.11.

¹³ Luke 1.34,35.

¹⁴ Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *Catechesi* 37 (PG 45.93ff.).

This is the body which is truly united to the Godhead, the same which is from the blessed Virgin. This is not because that body which was taken up to heaven comes down from heaven, but because the very bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of God. However, should you inquire as to the manner in which this is done, let it suffice for you to hear that it is done through the Holy Ghost, just as it was through the Holy Ghost that the Lord made flesh subsist for Himself and in Himself from the blessed Mother of God. And more than this we do not know, except that the word of God is true and effective and omnipotent, but the manner in which it is so is impossible to find out. What is more, it is not amiss to say this, that just as bread by being eaten and wine and water by being drunk are naturally changed into the body of the person eating and drinking and yet do not become another body than that which the person had before, so in the same way are the bread of the offertory and the wine and water supernaturally changed into the body and blood of Christ by the invocation and coming down of the Holy Ghost, yet they are not two bodies, but one and the same.

Hence, it is unto remission of sins and eternal life and unto a safeguard for body and soul and for such as partake worthily thereof and with faith. But for such as receive unworthily and without faith it is unto chastisement and punishment. It is just as the Lord's death has become life and immortality for those who believe, whereas for those who do not and for those who killed the Lord it is unto chastisement and eternal punishment.

The bread and wine are not a figure of the body and blood of Christ—God forbid!—but the actual deified body of the Lord, because the Lord Himself said: 'This is my body'; not 'a figure of my body' but 'my body,' and not 'a figure of my blood' but 'my blood.' Even before this He had said to the Jews: 'except you eat of the flesh of the

Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. For my flesh is meat indeed: and my blood is drink indeed.' And again: 'He that eateth me, shall live.'¹⁵

Wherefore, in all fear and with a pure conscience and undoubting faith let us approach, and it will be to us altogether as we believe and do not doubt. And let us honor it with all purity of body and soul, for it is twofold. Let us approach it with burning desire, and with our hands folded in the form of a cross¹⁶ let us receive the body of the Crucified. With eyes, lips, and faces turned toward it let us receive the divine burning coal, so that the fire of the coal may be added to the desire within us to consume our sins and enlighten our hearts, and so that by this communion of the divine fire we may be set afire and deified. Isaias saw a live coal,¹⁷ and this coal was not plain wood but wood joined with fire. Thus also, the bread of communion is not a plain bread, but bread joined with the Godhead. And the body joined with the Godhead is not one nature. On the contrary, that of the body is one, whereas that of the Godhead joined with it is another—so that both together are not one nature, but two.

It was with bread and wine that Melchisedech, the priest of the most high God, received Abraham, when he was returning from the slaughter of the alien tribes.¹⁸ That altar prefigured this mystical altar, even as that priest was a type and figure of the true Archpriest who is Christ. For 'thou,' He says, 'art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech.'¹⁹ This bread was figured by the loaves of proposition. This is quite plainly the pure and unbloody sacrifice which the Lord, through the mouth of the Prophet, said

¹⁵ John 6.54-58.

¹⁶ Cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Discourse* 23.21 (PG 33.1124B-1125A); Council in Trullo (Quinisext), Can. 101, Hardouin, *Acta Conciliorum* 3 (Paris 1714), cols. 1696E-1697A.

¹⁷ Cf. Isa. 6.6.

¹⁸ Cf. Gen. 14.18; Heb. 7.1.

¹⁹ Ps. 109.4; Heb. 7.17.

was to be offered to Him from the rising of the sun even to its going down.²⁰

It is Christ's body and blood entering into the composition of our soul and body without being consumed, without being corrupted, without passing into the privy—God forbid!—but into our substance for our sustenance, a bulwark against every sort of harm and a purifier from all uncleanness—as if He were to take adulterated gold and purify it by the discerning fire, so that in the life to come we shall not be condemned with the world. For He purifies by diseases and all sort of seizures, even as the divine Apostle says: 'But if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But whilst we are judged, we are chastised by the Lord, that we be not condemned with this world.' And this is what he says: 'For he that partaketh unworthily of the Lord eateth and drinketh judgment to himself.'²¹ When we are purified by it, we become one with the body of the Lord and with His spirit, and we become the body of Christ.

This bread is the first-fruits of the bread to come, which is the supersubstantial bread.²² For *supersubstantial* either means that which is to come, that is, the bread of the world to come, or it means that which is taken for the sustenance of our substance. So, whether it be the one or the other, the term will be suitably applicable to the body of the Lord, because, since the flesh of the Lord was conceived of the life-giving Spirit, it is itself life-giving spirit—for 'that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.'²³ I say this not to detract from the nature of the body, but because I wish to show its life-giving and divine character.

Moreover, although some may have called the bread and wine *antitypes* of the body and blood of the Lord, as did the inspired Basil,²⁴ they did not say this as referring to

²⁰ Cf. Mal. 1.11.

²¹ 1 Cor. 11.31,32,29.

²² Cf. Matt. 6.11; Cyril of Jerusalem, *op. cit.* 15 (PG 33.1120B).

²³ John 3.6.

²⁴ Cf. Liturgy of St. Basil, prayer of the *epiclesis* (F. E. Brighman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western* 1 [Oxford 1896] 329).

after the consecration, but to before the consecration, and it was thus that they called the offertory bread itself.

It is called *participation* because through it we participate in the divinity of Jesus. It is also called *communion*, and truly is so, because of our having communion through it with Christ and partaking both of His flesh and His divinity, and because through it we have communion with and are united to one another. For, since we partake of one bread, we all become one body of Christ and one blood and members of one another and are accounted of the same body with Christ.

Let us then make every effort to guard against receiving communion from heretics or giving it to them. 'Give not that which is holy to dogs,' says the Lord, 'neither cast ye your pearls before swine,'²⁵ lest we become sharers in their false teachings and their condemnation. If there really is such a union with Christ and with each other, then we really become united deliberately with all those with whom we communicate together, for this union comes from deliberate choice and not without the intervention of our judgment. 'For we are all one body, because we partake of one bread,' as the divine Apostle says.²⁶

They are called antitypes of the things to come, not because they are not really the body and blood of Christ, but because it is through them that we participate in the divinity of Christ now, while then it will be through the intellect and by vision alone.

Chapter 14

Since in what has gone before we have discussed to some extent the holy and most celebrated Ever-Virgin and Mother of God and have shown what is most important of all, how she is really and truly the Mother of God and is so called,

²⁵ Matt. 7.6.

²⁶ 1 Cor. 10.17.

let us now supply what remains to be said. She was predestined in the eternal foreknowing counsel of God and she was prefigured by various figures and foretold by the Holy Ghost through the words of the Prophets. Then, at the predestined time, she sprang from the root of David in fulfillment of the promises which had been made to him. For it is written: 'The Lord hath sworn truth to David, and he will not make it void: Of the fruit of thy womb I will set upon thy throne', and again: 'Once have I sworn by my holiness: I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure forever. And his throne as the sun before me, and as the moon perfect for ever: and a faithful witness in heaven.'¹ And Isaias: 'There shall come forth a rod out of the root of Jesse: and a flower shall rise up out of his root.'²

The most holy Evangelists Matthew and Luke have distinctly shown how Joseph is descended from the tribe of David. Matthew, however, traces the descent of Joseph from David through Solomon, whereas Luke traces it through Nathan. Yet both have passed over the lineage of the blessed Virgin in silence.

One should know, however, that it was not customary for the Hebrews, nor for sacred Scripture either, to give the pedigrees of women. But there was a law that one tribe should not marry into another.³ And Joseph, who was descended from the tribe of David and was a just man, for the holy Gospel testifies to this in his regard,⁴ would not have espoused the blessed Virgin illegally, but only if she were descended from the same tribe. Consequently, it was sufficient to show the descent of Joseph.

One should know this, too, that there was a law that the brother of a man dying without issue should marry the wife of the deceased and raise up seed for his brother.⁵ Thus, the offspring belonged by nature to the second, that is to say,

¹ Ps. 131.11; 88.36-38.

² Isa. 11.1.

³ Cf. Num. 36.6.

⁴ Cf. Matt. 1.19.

⁵ Cf. Deut. 25.5.

to the one who had begotten it, but by law to the deceased.

Levi was born from the line of Nathan the son of David and he begot Melchi and Panther. Panther begot Barpanther, for such was he called. This Barpanther begot Joachim, and Joachim begot the holy Mother of God. Mathan, however, had a wife from the line of Solomon the son of David, and from her begot Jacob. Then, when Mathan died, Melchi, who was of the tribe of Nathan and the son of Levi and brother of Panther, married the wife of Mathan. It was she who was the mother of Jacob, and from her Melchi begot Heli. Thus, Jacob and Heli were born of the same mother, but Jacob was of the tribe of Solomon, while Heli was of the tribe of Nathan. Heli, however, who was of the tribe of Nathan, died childless, and his brother Jacob, who was of the tribe of Solomon, took his wife and raised up seed for his brother and begot Joseph. So, while Joseph was by nature a son of Jacob of the descent of Solomon, he was by law son of Heli, who was of the line of Nathan.

And so Joachim took the noble and praiseworthy Anna in marriage.⁶ Then, even as the earlier Anna, although barren, had through prayer and a vow given birth to Samuel,⁷ so did this Anna through supplication and a vow receive from God the Mother of God, so that not even in this should she be inferior to any of the illustrious mothers. Thus, Grace, for such is the interpretation of Anna, brings forth the Lady, for that is the meaning of the name Mary. And Mary really did become Lady of all created things, since she was accounted Mother of the Creator. And she was born in the house of Joachim at the Probatica and was brought to the Temple. From then on she grew up in the house of God, nourished by the Spirit, and like a fruitful olive tree⁸ became and abode of every virtue with her mind removed from every worldly and carnal desire. And thus, as was fitting for

6 Cf. *Protevangelium of James* 1-2.

7 Cf. 1 Kings 1.11.

8 Cf. Ps. 51.10.

her who was to conceive God within herself, she kept her soul and body virginal, for He is holy and abides in holy ones. Thus, then, she sought holiness and was shown to be a holy and wondrous temple worthy of the most high God.

However, since the Enemy of our salvation was keeping an eye on virgins because of the prophecy of Isaias, who said: 'Behold a virgin shall be with child and bring forth a son: and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us,'⁹ the maid was betrothed to Joseph by the priests as 'the sealed book is delivered to one that is learned,'¹⁰ in order that He 'who catcheth the wise in their craftiness'¹¹ might ensnare him who ever glories in wisdom.¹² And the betrothal was at once a safeguard for the virgin and a deception for him who was keeping his eye on virgins. Now, when the fullness of time came, an angel of the Lord was sent to her with the good news of her conception of the Lord. And thus she conceived the Son of God, the subsistent power of the Father, 'not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man'¹³—that is to say, not of carnal conjunction and seed—but of the good pleasure of the Father and the co-operation of the Holy Ghost. To the Creator she gave that He might be created, to the Fashioner that He might be fashioned, and to the Son of God and God that He might from her innocent and undefiled flesh and blood put on flesh and become man. And thus she paid the debt for the first mother. For, as Eve was formed from Adam without carnal conjunction, so did this one bring forth the new Adam in accordance with the law of gestation but surpassing the nature of generation. Thus, He who is without a mother begotten of a father was without a father born of a woman. And because it was of a woman it was in accordance with the law of gestation; while, because it was without father, it surpassed the nature of generation.

9 Matt. 1.23; Isa. 7.14.

10 Isa. 29.11.

11 Job 5.13.

12 Cf. Jer. 9.23.

13 John 1.13.

And because it was at the normal time, for having completed the nine-month period He was born at the beginning of the tenth, it was in accordance with the law of gestation; while because it was without pain, it surpassed the established order of birth—for, where pleasure had not preceded, pain did not follow, as the Prophet said: 'Before she was in labor, she brought forth,' and again: 'before her time came to be delivered she brought forth a man child.'¹⁴

And so the Son of God became incarnate and was born of her. It was not as God-bearing man that He was born of her, but as God incarnate; not as a prophet anointed through the operation of the one anointing, but as one anointed with the entire presence of the one anointing—so that the one anointing became man and the one anointed became God; not by a change in nature, but by the hypostatic union. For, He was the same who anointed and who was anointed, as God anointing Himself as man. How, then, is she not Mother of God who from herself brought forth God incarnate? Actually, she is really and truly Mother of God, Lady, and Mistress of all created things, being accounted both handmaid and mother of the Creator. And just as at His conception He had kept her who conceived Him a virgin, so also at His birth did He maintain her virginity intact, because He alone passed through her and kept her shut.¹⁵ While the conception was by hearing, the birth was by the usual orifice through which children are born, even though there are some who concoct an idle tale of His being born from the side of the Mother of God. For it was not impossible for Him to pass through the gate without breaking its seals.

Hence, the Ever-Virgin remained a virgin even after giving birth and never had converse with a husband as long as she lived. For, even though it is written: 'And he knew her not

¹⁴ Isa. 66.7.

¹⁵ Cf. Ezech. 44.2.

till she brought forth her firstborn son,'¹⁶ one must know that the first child to be born is the firstborn, even though it may also be the only-begotten. Firstborn means having been born first, and does not by any means imply the birth of others; on the other hand, the 'till' signifies the fulfillment of the appointed time, without excluding the time after that. Thus, the Lord says: 'And behold I am with you all days, even till the consummation of the world,'¹⁷ without meaning that He is to be separated after the consummation of the world. The divine Apostle certainly says: 'And so shall we be always with the Lord,'¹⁸ meaning after the general resurrection.

How, indeed, would she have given birth to God and have known the miracle from the experience of subsequent events and then have allowed intercourse with a husband? Far be it! The thinking of such things is beyond the bounds of prudent thought, let alone the doing of them.

However, this blessed one, who had been found worthy of gifts surpassing nature, did at the time of the Passion suffer the pangs which she had escaped at childbirth. For, when she saw Him put to the death as a criminal, whom she knew to be God when she gave birth to Him, her heart was torn from maternal compassion and she was rent by her thoughts as by a sword. This is the meaning of 'And thy own soul a sword shall pierce.'¹⁹ But her grief gave way to the joy of the resurrection, the resurrection which proclaimed Him to be God who had died in the flesh.

¹⁶ Matt. 1.25.

¹⁷ Matt. 28.20.

¹⁸ 1 Thess. 4.16.

¹⁹ Luke 2.35.

Chapter 15

The saints must be honored as friends of Christ and children and heirs of God, as John the Theologian and Evangelist says: 'But as many as received him, he gave them the power to be made the sons of God.'¹ 'Therefore they are no longer servants, but sons: and if sons, heirs also, heirs indeed of God and joint heirs with Christ.'² And again, in the holy Gospels the Lord says to the Apostles: 'You are my friends. . . I will not now call you servants: for the servant knoweth not what his lord doth.'³ Furthermore, if the Creator and Lord of all is called both King of kings and Lord of lords and God of gods,⁴ then most certainly the saints, too, are both gods and lords and kings. God both is and is said to be their God and Lord and King. 'For I am,' He said to Moses, 'the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob,' and God appointed Moses the God of Pharaoh.⁵ However, I say that they are gods, lords, and kings not by nature, but because they have ruled over and dominated sufferings, and because they have kept undebased the likeness of the divine image to which they were made—for the image of the king is also called a king, and, finally, because they have freely been united to God and receiving Him as a dweller within themselves have through association with Him become by grace what He is by nature. How, then, should these not be honored who have been accounted servants, friends, and sons of God? For the honor shown the more sensible of one's fellow servants gives proof of one's love for the common Master.

These are become repositories and pure dwelling places of God, for 'I will dwell in them and walk among them,'

¹ John 1.12.

² Gal. 4.7; Rom. 8.17.

³ John 15.14,15.

⁴ Apoc. 19.16; Ps. 49.1.

⁵ Exod. 3.6; 7.1.

says God, 'and I will be their God.'⁶ So, indeed, sacred Scripture says that 'the souls of the just are in the hand of God: and death shall not touch them.'⁷ For the death of the saints is rather sleep than death, since 'they have labored unto eternity and shall live unto the end,' and 'precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints.'⁸ What then is more precious than to be in the hand of God? For God is life and light, and they that are in the hand of God abide in life and light.

Moreover, because through their mind God has also dwelt in their bodies, the Apostle says: 'Know you not that your members are the temple of the Holy Ghost, who is in you?'; 'Now the Lord is the Spirit'; and again: 'If any man violate the temple of God, him shall God destroy.'⁹ How, then, should they not be honored, who are the living temples of God, the living tabernacles of God. These in life openly took their stand with God.

In the relics of the saints the Lord Christ has provided us with saving fountains which in many ways pour out benefactions and gush with fragrant ointment.¹⁰ And let no one disbelieve. For, if by the will of God water poured out of the precipitous living rock in the desert, and for the thirsty Sampson from the jawbone of an ass,¹¹ is it unbelievable that fragrant ointment should flow from the relics of the martyrs? Certainly not, at least for such as know the power of God and the honor which the saints have from Him.

In the Law, anyone who touched a corpse was accounted unclean.¹² But these of whom we speak are not dead. Because Life itself and the Author of life was reckoned amongst the

6 2 Cor. 6.16; Lev. 26.12.

7 Wisd. 3.1.

8 Ps. 48.9,10; 115.15.

9 1 Cor. 6.19; 2 Cor. 3.17; 1 Cor. 3.17.

10 The special epithet *myroblytus*, or 'gushing ointment,' is applied to certain saints whose relics exude a fragrant oil. The two most famous *myroblytae* are St. Demetrius of Salonica and St. Nicholas of Bari.

11 Cf. Exod. 17.6; Judges 15.19.

12 Cf. Num. 19.11.

dead, we do not call these dead who have fallen asleep in the hope of resurrection and in the faith in Him. For how can a dead body work miracles? How, then, through them are demons put to flight, diseases driven out, the sick cured, the blind restored to sight, lepers cleansed, temptation and trouble driven away; and how through them does 'every best gift come down from the Father of lights'¹³ to them who ask with undoubting faith? What would you not do to find a patron to present you to a mortal king and intercede with him in your behalf? Are not the patrons of the entire race to be honored who make petitions to God in our behalf? Yes, indeed; we must honor them by raising churches to God in their name, by making fruit-offerings, and by celebrating their anniversaries and taking spiritual joy in these, such as will be the very joy of our hosts, but taking care lest in endeavoring to do them honor we may give them annoyance instead. For by some things honor is given to God and they who serve Him rejoice in them, whereas by others He is offended and so, too, are His shield-bearers. 'In psalms and hymns and spiritual canticles,'¹⁴ in compunction, and in compassion for the needy let us faithful do honor to the saints, through whom most especially is honor rendered to God. Let us set up monuments to them, and visible images, and let us ourselves by the imitation of their virtues become their living monuments and images. Let us honor the Mother of God as really and truly God's Mother. Let us honor the Prophet John as precursor and baptist, apostle and martyr, for 'there hath not risen among them that are born of women a greater than John,'¹⁵ as the Lord said, and he was the first herald of the kingdom. Let us honor the Apostles as brethren of the Lord, as eye-witnesses and attendants to His sufferings, whom God the Father 'foreknew and predestinated

¹³ James 1.17.

¹⁴ Eph. 5.19.

¹⁵ Matt. 11.11.

to be made conformable to the image of his Son,¹⁶ 'first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly shepherds and teachers.'¹⁷ And let us honor the holy martyrs of the Lord who have been picked from every rank and whose corps commander is Christ's archdeacon, apostle, and protomartyr Stephen; let us honor them as soldiers of Christ who have drunk of His chalice and have then been baptized with the baptism of His life-giving death, and as participants in His sufferings and His glory. Let us also honor those sainted fathers of ours, the God-bearing ascetics who have struggled through the more drawn-out and laborious martyrdom of the conscience, 'who wandered about in sheepskins, in goatskins, being in want, distressed, afflicted: wandering in deserts, in mountains and in dens and in caves of the earth: of whom the world was not worthy.'¹⁸ Let us honor the Prophets who preceded the Grace, the patriarchs and just men who announced beforehand the advent of the Lord. Let us carefully observe the manner of life of all these and let us emulate their faith, charity, hope, zeal, life, patience under suffering, and perseverance unto death, so that we may also share their crowns of glory.

Chapter 16

Since there are certain people who find great fault with us for adoring and honoring both the image of the Saviour and that of our Lady, as well as those of the rest of the saints and servants of Christ, let them hear how from the beginning God made man to His own image.¹ For what reason, then, do we adore one another, except because we have been made to the image of God? As the inspired Basil, who is deeply learned in theology, says: 'the honor paid to the

¹⁶ Rom. 8.29.

¹⁷ 1 Cor. 12.28.

¹⁸ Heb. 11.37,38.

¹ Cf. Gen. 1.26.

image redounds to the original,'² and the original is the thing imaged from which the copy is made. For what reason did the people of Moses adore from round about the tabernacle which bore an image and pattern of heavenly things, or rather, of all creation?³ Indeed, God had said to Moses: 'See that thou make all things according to the pattern which was shewn thee on the mount.' And the Cherubim, too, that overshadowed the propitiatory, were they not the handiwork of men?⁴ And what was the celebrated temple in Jerusalem? Was it not built and furnished by human hands and skill?⁵

Now, sacred Scripture condemns those who adore graven things, and also those who sacrifice to the demons. The Greeks used to sacrifice and the Jews also used to sacrifice; but the Greeks sacrifice to the demons, whereas the Jews sacrificed to God. And the sacrifice of the Greeks was rejected and condemned, while the sacrifice of the just was acceptable to God. Thus, Noe sacrificed 'and the Lord smelled a sweet savor'⁶ of the good intention and accepted the fragrance of the gift offered to Him. And thus the statues of the Greeks happen to be rejected and condemned, because they were representations of demons.

But, furthermore, who can make a copy of the invisible, incorporeal, uncircumscribed, and unportrayable God? It is, then, highly insane and impious to give a form to the God-head. For this reason it was not the practice in the Old Testament to use images. However, through the bowels of His mercy God for our salvation was made man in truth, not in the appearance of man, as He was seen by Abraham or the Prophets, but really made man in substance. Then He

2 Basil, *On the Holy Ghost* 18.45 (PG 32.149C).

3 Cf. Exod. 33.10.

4 Cf. Heb. 8.5; Exod. 25.40,20.

5 Cf. 3 Kings 6.

6 Gen. 8.21.

abode on earth, conversed with men,⁷ worked miracles, suffered, was crucified, rose again, and was taken up; and all these things really happened and were seen by men and, indeed, written down to remind and instruct us, who were not present then, so that, although we have not seen, yet hearing and believing we may attain to the blessedness of the Lord. Since, however, not all know letters nor do all have leisure to read, the Fathers deemed it fit that these events should be depicted as a sort of memorial and terse reminder. (It certainly happens frequently that at times when we do not have the Lord's Passion in mind we may see the image of His crucifixion and, being thus reminded of His saving Passion, fall down and adore. But it is not the material which we adore, but that which is represented; just as we do not adore the material of the Gospel or that of the cross, but that which they typify.) For what is the difference between a cross which does not typify the Lord and one which does? It is the same way with the Mother of God, too, for the honor paid her is referred to Him who was incarnate of her. And similarly, also, we are stirred up by the exploits of the holy men to manliness, zeal, imitation of their virtues, and the glory of God. For, as we have said, the honor shown the more sensible of one's fellow servants gives proof of one's love for the common Master, and the honor paid to the image redounds to the original. This is the written tradition, just as is worshiping toward the east, adoring the cross, and so many other similar things.⁸

Furthermore, there is a story told⁹ about how, when Abgar was lord of the city of Edessenes, he sent an artist to make a portrait of the Lord, and how, when the artist was unable

7 Cf. Bar. 3.38.

8 Cf. Basil, *op. cit.* 27.66 (PG 32.188B).

9 The earliest form of the Syriac legend of Abgar, the first Christian king of Edessa, is to be found in Eusebius (*Eccles. Hist.* 1.13). The later and more amplified version containing the incident of the portrait here referred to is to be found in the Syriac document known as the *Doctrine of Addai* (translated and published by G. Phillips, London 1876).

to do this because of the radiance of His face, the Lord Himself pressed a bit of cloth to His own sacred and life-giving face and left His own image on the cloth and so sent this to Abgar who had so earnestly desired it.

And Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles, writes that the Apostles handed down a great many things unwritten: 'Therefore, brethren, stand fast: and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistle'; and to the Corinthians: 'Now I praise you, brethren, that in all things you are mindful of me and keep my ordinances as I have delivered them to you.'¹⁰

Chapter 17

The God proclaimed by the Old Testament and the New is one He who is celebrated and glorified in Trinity, for the Lord said: 'I am not to come to destroy the law, but to fulfil.'¹ For He worked our salvation, for the sake of which all Scripture and every mystery has been revealed. And again: 'Search the scriptures: for these give testimony of me.'² And the Apostle too, says: 'God, who, at sundry times and in diverse manners, spoke in times past to the fathers by prophets, last of all, in these days, hath spoken to us by his Son.'³ Through the Holy Ghost, then, both the Law and the Prophets, the evangelists, apostles, pastors, and teachers spoke.

Therefore, 'all scripture, inspired of God, is quite profitable,'⁴ so that to search the sacred Scripture is very good and most profitable for the soul. For, 'like a tree which is planted

10 2 Thess. 2.14; 1 Cor. 11.2.

1 Matt. 5.17.

2 John 5.39.

3 Heb. 1.1-2.

4 2 Tim. 3.16.

near the running waters,⁵ so does the soul watered by sacred Scripture also grow fat and bear fruit in due season, which is the orthodox faith, and so is it adorned with its ever-green leaves, with actions pleasing to God, I mean. And thus we are disposed to virtuous action and untroubled contemplation by the sacred Scriptures. In them we find exhortation to every virtue and dissuasion from every vice. Therefore, if we are eager for knowledge, we shall also be rich in knowledge, for by diligence, toil, and the grace of God who grants it all things succeed. 'For he that asketh receiveth: and he that seeketh findeth: and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.'⁶ So let us knock at the very beautiful paradise of the Scriptures, the fragrant, most sweet and lovely paradise which fills our ears with the varied songs of inspired spiritual birds, which touches our heart, comforting it when grieving, calming it when angry, and filling it with everlasting joy, and which lifts our mind onto the back of the sacred dove, gleaming with gold and most brilliant,⁷ who bears us with his most bright wings to the only-begotten Son and heir of the Husbandman of the spiritual vineyard and through Him on to the Father of lights. Let us not knock casually, but with eagerness and persistence, and let us not lose heart while knocking, for so it will be opened to us. Should we read once and then a second time and still not understand what we are reading, let us not be discouraged. Rather, let us persist, let us meditate and inquire, for it is written: 'Ask thy father, and he will declare to thee: thy elders and they will tell thee.'⁸ For not all have knowledge.⁹ From the fountain of paradise let us draw everflowing and most pure waters springing up into life everlasting.¹⁰ Let us revel in them, let us revel greedily in them to satiety, for they contain the grace which cannot

5 Ps. 1.3.

6 Luke 11.10.

7 Cf. Ps. 67.14.

8 Deut. 32.7.

9 Cf. 1 Cor. 8.7.

10 Cf. John 4.14.

be exhausted. Should we, however, be able to get some profit from other sources, this is not forbidden. Let us be proved bankers and amass the genuine and pure gold, while we reject the spurious. Let us accept the best sayings, but let us throw to the dogs the ridiculous gods and unhealthy fables, for from the former we should be able to draw very great strength against the latter.

One must know that there are twenty-two books of the Old Testament, corresponding to the letters of the Hebrew alphabet,¹¹ for the Hebrews have twenty-two letters, of which five are doubled so as to make twenty-seven. Thus, *kaph*, *mem*, *nun*, *pe*, and *sade* are double. For this reason the books, too, are numbered this way and are found to be twenty-seven, because five of them are doubled. Ruth is combined with Judges and counted as one book by the Hebrews. Kings 1 and 2 make one book; 3 and 4 Kings, one book; 1 and 2 Paralipomenon, one book; and 1 and 2 Esdras, one book. Thus, the books fall into four groups of five, as follows. There are five books of the Law: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. This first group of five is also called the Law. Then, another group of five books called the Writings, or, by some, the Sacred Books, which are as follows: Josue, son of Nave; Judges, together with Ruth; 1 and 2 Kings making one book; 3 and 4 Kings making one book; and the two Paralipomenons making one book. This is the second group of five books. A third group of five is made up of the poetical books, namely: Job, the Psalter, the Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes of the same, and the Canticle of Canticles of the same. A fourth group of five books is the prophetic, which is made up of the twelve minor Prophets, making one book, Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, and then the two books of Esdras combined into one, and Esther. The All-Virtuous Wisdom, however, that is to say, the Wisdom of Solomon—and the Wisdom of Jesus, which the father of Sirach composed in

11 Epiphanius, *On Weights and Measures* (PG 43.244A).

Hebrew but which was translated into Greek by his grandson, Jesus son of Sirach—these are indeed admirable and full of virtue, but they are not counted, nor were they placed in the Ark.

In the New Testament there are: four Gospels, those according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; the Acts of the holy Apostles by Luke the Evangelist; seven Catholic Epistles—one of James, two of Peter, three of John, and one of Jude; fourteen Epistles of the Apostle Paul; the Apocalypse of John the Evangelist; and the Canons of the Holy Apostles by Clement.¹²

Chapter 18

The things that are said about Christ fall into four general classes, for, while some apply to Him before the Incarnation, others do in the union, others after the union, and still others after the resurrection.

Of those applying before the Incarnation, there are six kinds. Thus, some show the union of nature and consubstantiality with the Father, as 'I and the Father are one'; 'He that seeth me seeth the Father also'; 'Who being in the form of God,'¹ and the like.

Others show the perfection of the hypostasis, as 'Son of God'; 'figure of his substance'; 'Angel of great counsel, Wonderful, Counsellor,'² and the like.

¹² The *Apostolic Canons* was a collection of eighty-five canons, mostly disciplinary and mostly taken from local Oriental councils of the fourth century. This collection was included in Book 8 of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the whole being attributed to St. Clement. The Council in Trullo (692), while rejecting the *Constitutions*, retained and approved the *Canons*. The *Canons*, the Damascene not withstanding, were never generally considered to belong to the canon of Scripture.

¹ John 10.30; 14.9; Phil. 2.6.

² John 1.34; Heb. 1.3; Isa. 9.6.

Others show the mutual indwelling of the Persons in one another, as 'I am in the Father and the Father in me,'³ and their inseparable indwelling, as Word, Wisdom, Power and Brightness. For the word, meaning the substantial word, while springing from the mind dwells in it inseparably from it; and also the wisdom in the mind, the power in the powerful, and the brightness in the light.

Others show how He is from the Father as from a cause, as 'the Father is greater than I'⁴ for from Him He had His being and everything that He has—His being by generation, that is, not by creation,⁵ as 'I came forth from the Father and I am come' and 'I live by the Father.'⁶ Now, everything that He has He has not by communication and not by instruction but as from a cause, as 'the Son cannot do anything of himself, but what he seeth the Father doing.'⁷ For, if there is no Father, then neither is there a Son, for the Son is from the Father, and in the Father and simultaneously with the Father and not after the Father. Similarly also, what He does He does of Him and with Him, for the will, operation, and power of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost are identical—not like, but the same.

Others show how things willed by the Father are fulfilled by Him, not as by an instrument or a servant, but as by His substantial and subsistent Word, Wisdom, and Power, because motion in Father and Son are seen to be one, as 'all things were made by him'; 'he sent his word, and healed them'; and 'that they may believe that thou hast sent me.'⁸

Some, finally, are said prophetically. Of these some are said as future, as, for example, 'he shall come manifestly'; the words of Zacharias: 'Behold thy King will come to thee'; and what was said by Micheas: 'For behold the Lord will

3 John 14.10.

4 John 14.28.

5 Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 30.7 (PG 36.112-113).

6 John 16.28; 6.58.

7 John 5.19.

8 John 1.3; Ps. 106.20; John 11.42.

come forth out of his place: and he will come down and will tread upon the high places of the earth.⁹ Others, however, refer to future events as past, as 'This is our God. . . .Afterwards, he was seen upon earth and conversed with men'; 'The Lord created me a beginning of his ways unto his works'; and 'Therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows,'¹⁰ and the like.

Now, the things said of Him before the union may also be said of Him after the union, but those after the union may by no means be said of Him before the union, unless, indeed, it be by way of prophecy. Moreover, there are three kinds of things said of Him in the union. Thus, when we talk from the point of view of the more excellent, we speak of 'deification of the flesh,' 'becoming the Word,' 'exaltation,' and the like, showing the wealth accrued to the flesh by its union and intimate conjunction with the sublime Divine Word. When, on the other hand, we talk from the point of view of the less excellent, we speak of the 'Incarnation' of God the Word, His 'being made man,' 'emptying Himself out,' 'poverty,' 'abasement,' because these things and their like are attributed to God the Word on account of His being compounded with the humanity. But, when we talk with both in mind, we speak of 'union,' 'communication,' 'anointing,' 'intimate conjunction,' 'conformation,' and the like. Thus, by this third kind of things said the first two already mentioned are implied, for by the union there is shown what each one had from the junction and mutual indwelling of the one co-existing with it.

Because of the hypostatic union the flesh is said to have been deified, to have become God and of the same divinity with the Word;¹¹ at the same time God the Word is said to have been made flesh, to have become man, to be declared a creature and called last.¹² This is not because the two

9 Ps. 49.3; Zach. 9.9; Mich. 1.3.

10 Bar. 3.36,38; Prov. 8.22 (Septuagint); Ps. 44.8.

11 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 39.16 (PG 36.353B).

12 Cf. Isa. 53.3.

natures were transformed into one compound nature—it is impossible for contradictory natural qualities to exist together in one nature—but because they were hypostatically united and indwell mutually one in the other without confusion or transformation. The mutual indwelling, however, did not come from the flesh, but from the divinity, because it is inconceivable that the flesh should indwell the divinity—rather, at once the divine nature indwelt the flesh, it gave the flesh this same ineffable mutual indwelling, which, indeed, we call union.

One must furthermore know that in the first and second kinds of things said in the union the reverse is found. For, when we talk about the flesh, we speak of ‘deification,’ ‘becoming the Word,’ ‘exaltation,’ and ‘anointing,’ for, while these come from the divinity, they are to be found in the flesh. When, on the other hand, we talk about the Word, we speak of ‘emptying out,’ ‘incarnation,’ ‘becoming man,’ ‘abasement,’ and the like, which as we have said, are attributed to God the Word because He endured them willingly.

There are three kinds of things said about Christ after the union. The first is indicative of the divine nature, as ‘I am in the Father and the Father in me’ and ‘I and the Father are one.’¹³ Then, everything that is attributed to Him before the union may also be attributed to Him after the union, with the exception of the fact that He has not yet assumed the flesh and its natural properties.

The second is indicative of the human nature, as ‘Why do you seek to kill me, a man who have spoken the truth to you,’ and ‘so must the Son of man be lifted up,’¹⁴ and the like.

Now, there are six kinds of these things which have been said and written about Christ the Saviour in His human quality, whether they were of things said or of things done.

¹³ John 14.10; 10.30.

¹⁴ John 7.20; 8.40; 3.14.

Thus, some of them were done and said naturally through the dispensation. Such, for example, were His birth of the Virgin; His growing and advance in age; His hunger, thirst, weariness, tears, sleeping, being pierced with the nails, death; and all such other things as are natural and blameless passions. He might show that besides being God He was truly man. For, although there is indeed a mingling of the divinity with the humanity in all of these things, it is understood that they truly belong to the body and that the divinity suffered none of them, but through them worked our salvation.

Others are after the manner of a fiction, as, for example, His asking 'Where have you laid Lazarus?' His coming to the fig tree; His retiring, that is to say, withdrawing; His praying; and when 'he made as though he would go farther.'¹⁵ For, these things and others of the same sort He did not need to do, either as God or as man; He was merely assuming a human way of acting as required by the advantage and profit to be gained thereby. For example, He prayed to show that He was not at variance with God and also to show that He honored the Father as His own cause. He asked questions, not because He did not know, but that He retired, in order that He might teach us not to be reckless and not to betray ourselves.

Others are by appropriation and said relatively, as 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'; and 'him, who knew no sin, he hath made sin for us'; and 'being made a curse for us'; and 'the Son also himself shall be subject unto him that put all things under him.'¹⁶ For neither as God nor as man was He ever forsaken by the Father;¹⁷ neither was He made a sin or a curse, nor did He need to be subject to the Father. And as God He is equal to the Father and in no way at variance with Him or subject to Him, while as man He was never at any time so deaf to

¹⁵ John 11.34; Matt. 21.19; 12.15; 26.39; John 11.41; Luke 24.28.

¹⁶ Matt. 27.46; 2 Cor. 5.21; Gal. 3.13; 1 Cor. 15.28.

¹⁷ Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 30.5 (PG 36.109A).

His Begetter that He should stand in need of subjection. So it was in appropriating our appearance and classing Himself with us that He said these things, for it was we who were subject to sin and curse, because we were disobedient and unhearing and thus forsaken.

Others are by distinction of reason. Thus, if you make a distinction in your mind between things which are really inseparable, that is to say, between the flesh and the Word, then He is said to be a servant and ignorant.¹⁸ This is so because He was of a servile and ignorant nature, and unless the flesh has been united to God the Word it would have been servile and ignorant. However, because of its hypostatic union with God the Word, it was not servile and it was not ignorant. In the same way, also, He called the Father His God.

Others are for our enlightenment and assurance, as 'Glorify thou me, O Father, with thyself, with the glory which I had, before the world was.'¹⁹ For He had indeed been glorified and is so, but His glory had not been made plain and certain to us. And then, that which was said by the Apostle: 'Who was predestinated the Son of God in power, according to the spirit of sanctification, by resurrection from the dead,'²⁰ for by His miracles and resurrection and by the descent of the Holy Ghost it was made plain and certain to the world that He was the Son of God.²¹ And also: 'He advanced in wisdom and grace.'²²

Others are in accordance with His appropriation of the appearance of the Jews and His counting Himself as one of them, as when He said to the Samaritan woman: 'You

18 Cf. *ibid.* 29.18 (PG 36.97A).

19 John 17.5.

20 Rom. 1.4.

21 Cf. John Chrysostom, *Homily 1 on Epistle to the Romans 2* (PG 60.397).

22 Luke 2.52.

adore that which you know not: we adore that which we know. For salvation is of the Jews.'²³

The third kind of things said about Christ after the union is that which is indicative of the one Person and displays both natures, as, for example: 'I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me'; and 'I go to the Father: and you shall see me no longer'; and 'They would never have crucified the Lord of glory'; and 'no man ascended into heaven, but he that descended from heaven, the Son of man who is in heaven,'²⁴ and the like.

And now, finally, some of the things which are said about Christ after the resurrection pertain to the divinity, as 'baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost,' which is indicative of God the Son; and 'Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world,'²⁵ and the like, because He is with us as God. Others, however, pertain to the humanity, as 'they took hold of his feet,' and 'There they shall see me,'²⁶ and the like.

There are furthermore, several kinds of things said about Christ after the resurrection which pertain to the humanity. Some of these, although quite actual, are not according to nature, but by dispensation, to give assurance that it was the same identical body that had suffered that rose again. Such are the wounds, and the eating and drinking after the resurrection. Others, however, are both actual and according to nature, as the passing easily from place to place and the entering through closed doors. Still others are after the manner of a fiction, as 'he made as though he would go farther.'²⁷ Others pertain to both natures, as 'I ascend to my Father and to your Father, to my God and to your God'; and 'the

²³ John 4.22.

²⁴ John 6.58; 16.10; 1 Cor. 2.8; John 3.13.

²⁵ Matt. 28.19,20.

²⁶ Matt. 28.9,10.

²⁷ Luke 24.28.

King of Glory shall enter in'; and 'Who sitteth on the right hand of the majesty on high.'²⁸ And still others are said as if He were classing Himself with us by a mere distinction of reason, as 'my God and your God.'

Therefore, we must attribute the sublime things to the divine nature, which is naturally superior to passions and the flesh, whereas we must attribute the lowly ones to the human nature.²⁹ But those which are common to both we must attribute to the composite, that is to say to the one Christ who is God and man. And we must understand that both belong to one and the same, our Lord Jesus Christ. For, if we know what is proper to each and see that both are done by one, we shall believe rightly and not be deceived. From all of these things the distinction between the united natures is known, as well as the fact that, as the most divine Cyril says,³⁰ although divinity and humanity are not identical in their natural quality, there is definitely one Son and Christ and Lord. And since He is one, then His Person (πρόσωπον) is also one, and no division whatsoever will be introduced into the hypostatic union by our recognition of the difference between the natures.

Chapter 19

One should know that it is customary for sacred Scripture to call God's permission His action, as when the Apostle says in his Epistle to the Romans: 'Or hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump, to make one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour?'¹ He does indeed make both the one and the other, because He is the sole

28 John 20.17; Ps. 23.7; Heb. 1.3.

29 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 29.18 (PG 36.97B).

30 Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistle* 40 (PG 77.183BC).

1 Rom. 9.21.

Creator of all things, but it is the own deliberate choice of each and not He that makes them honorable or dishonorable.² This is also clear from what the Apostle himself says in his Second Epistle to Timothy: 'In a great house there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and of earth: and some indeed unto honour, but some unto dishonour. If any man therefore shall cleanse himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified and profitable to the Lord, prepared unto every work.'³ It is clear that this cleansing is done freely, for he says 'if any man shall cleanse himself,' the converse of which rejoins that, if he does not cleanse himself, he will be a vessel unto dishonor, of no use to Lord, and only fit to be broken. Thus, the foregoing quotation and that which reads: 'God hath concluded all in unbelief' and 'God hath given them the spirit of insensibility; eyes that they should not see and ears that they should not hear,'⁴ are none of them to be taken in the sense of God acting, but in that of God permitting because of free will and because virtue is not forced.

It is, then, customary for sacred Scripture to speak of His permission as an action and deed, but even when it goes so far as to say that God 'creates evil' and that 'there is not evil in a city, which the Lord hath not done,'⁵ it still does not show God to be the author of evil. On the contrary, since the word *evil* is ambiguous, it has two meanings, for it sometimes means what is by nature evil, being the opposite of virtue and against God's will, while at other times it means what is evil and painful in relation to our sensibility, which is to say, tribulation and distress. Now, while these last seem to be evil, because they cause pain, actually they are good, because to such as understand them they are a source of conversion and salvation. It is these last that Scripture says

2 Cf. Basil, *That God Is Not Author of Evils* (PG 31.340BC).

3 2 Tim. 2.20,21.

4 Rom. 11.32,8.

5 Isa. 45.7; Amos 3.6.

are caused by God. Moreover, one must know that we, too, cause them, because involuntary evils spring from voluntary ones.

This also must be known, that it is customary for Scripture to speak of some things as causes which really are chance effects, as: 'To thee only have I sinned, and have done evil before thee: that thou mayst be justified in thy words, and mayst overcome when thou art judged.'⁶ Now, he who sinned did not do so in order that God might overcome, and neither did God have any need of our sin for Him to appear as victor over it. For God incomparably bears off the prize of victory over all, and even over such as do not sin, because He is Creator, and beyond understanding, and uncreated, and He has glory which comes from His nature and not from without. However, because it is not unjust of Him to inflict His wrath, when we sin, or to forgive, when we repent, He is proclaimed victor over our evil. And it is not because of this that we sin, but because the matter turns out that way. For instance, should one be sitting at work and a friend drop in, then he will say: 'My friend has come to visit and so I shall not work today.' The friend did not come to keep him from working, but just happened to drop in. So he, being taken up with the entertainment of his friend, does not work. Such things are called chance effects, because the matter happens that way. What is more, God does not want to be the only one that is just, but wishes that all be like Him in so far as they are able.

Chapter 20

We shall now see that there are not two principles, the one good and the other evil.¹ For good and evil are mutually

⁶ Ps. 50.6.

¹ Cf. Athanasius, *Against the Pagans* 6 (PG 25.12-13).

opposed and mutually destructive and they cannot exist in or with each other. In this last case, each would be a part of the whole and, consequently, each would be circumscribed not only by the whole but by a part of the whole.

Then, who is there to apportion the space to each? For they will say that they can neither agree nor be reconciled, since evil would not be evil if it made peace by becoming reconciled with the good, nor would good be good if it were on friendly terms with evil. If, however, there were to be a third, who had marked out for each its own sphere, then he would more likely be God.

Moreover, one of the two alternatives would be necessary. Either they would have to be in contact with each other and thus destroy each other, or there would have to be something between them in which there was neither good nor evil and which would separate them like a sort of partition. Then there would no longer be two principles, but three.

And again, one of the following alternatives would be necessary. Either they would have to be at peace, which evil cannot do, because, should it be at peace, it would not be evil. Or they would have to fight, which good cannot do, because, should it fight, it would not be perfectly good. Or the evil would have to fight and the good not fight back and either be destroyed by the evil or always be in a state of affliction and distress, which is not a characteristic of good. Consequently, there must be one principle removed from all evil.

But, they say, if such is the case, where does the evil come from? For it is inconceivable that evil should originate from good. Then we reply that evil is no more than a negation of good² and a lapse from what is natural to what is unnatural, for there is nothing that is naturally evil. Now, as they were made, all things that God made were very good.³ So, if they remain as they were created, then they are very

² Cf. Basil, *op. cit.* (PG 31.341B).

³ Cf. Gen. 1.31.

good. But, if they freely withdraw from the natural and pass to the unnatural, then they become evil.

All things, then, by nature serve and obey the Creator. So, whenever any creature freely rebels and becomes disobedient to Him who made him, he has brought the evil upon himself. For evil is not some sort of a substance, nor yet a property of a substance, but an accident, that is to say, a deviation from the natural into the unnatural, which is just what sin is.

Then, where does sin come from?⁴ It is an invention of the free will of the Devil. Then, is the Devil evil? As he was made he was not evil, but good, because he was created a shining and most bright angel by the Creator, and free because rational. And he freely departed from his natural virtue, fell into the darkness of evil, and was removed far from God, the only Good and the only Giver of life and light. For from Him every good has its goodness, and in proportion as one is removed from Him in will—not, of course, in place—one becomes evil.

Chapter 21

God in His goodness brings into being from nothing the things that are made, and He foreknows what they are going to be. Now, if they were not going to be, they would never be evil in the future, nor would they be foreknown. For the object of knowledge is existing things; and that of foreknowledge, absolute futures. Also, being comes first and, afterwards, being good or evil. However, had God kept from being made those who through His goodness were to have existence, but who by their own choice were to become evil, then evil would have prevailed over the goodness of God. Thus, all things which God makes He makes good, but each one becomes good or evil by his own choice. So, even

⁴ Cf. Basil, *op. cit.* (PG 31.345D).

if the Lord did say: 'It were better for him if that man had not been born,'¹ He did not say so in deprecation of His own creature, but in deprecation of that creature's choice and rashness. For it was the rashness of his own will that made the Creator's benefaction useless to him. It is just as if someone who had been entrusted with wealth and authority by a king should tyrannize over his benefactor, and His benefactor, seeing that he is to persist in his tyranny to the end, should rightly bring him to hand and punish him.

Chapter 22

Good and more than good is the Divinity, and so also is His will, for what God wishes, that is good. The commandment which teaches us this is a law, so that we may abide in Him and be in light.¹ And the violation of this commandment is sin. Sin results from the Devil's suggestion and our own unconstrained and free acceptance of it. And this, too, is called a law.²

The law of God, then, acts upon our mind by drawing it to Him and spurring on our conscience. And our conscience is also called the law of our mind. The suggestion of the Devil, or the law of sin, also acts upon the members of our flesh and through it attacks us. For, once we succumbed to the suggestion of the Evil One and freely violated the law of God, we allowed this suggestion to gain entrance and sold ourselves to sin. For this reason our body is easily brought to sin. Hence, the odor and sense of sin which is inherent in our body, that is to say, the concupiscence and pleasure of the body, is also called a law in the members of our flesh.

¹ Mark 14.21.

¹ Cf. 1 John 1.7.

² Cf. Rom. 7.23.

Accordingly, the law of my mind—my conscience, that is to say—rejoices in the law of God, or His commandment, and wills it. On the other hand, the law of sin—that is to say, the suggestion that comes through the law in our members, or the concupiscence and base tendency and movement of the body and the irrational part of the soul—fights against the law of my mind, that is to say, my conscience, and captivates me. It does this by insinuating itself, even though I do will the law of God and love it and do not will to sin, and it deceives me and persuades me to become a slave to sin through the softness of pleasure and the concupiscence of the body and the irrational part of the soul, as I have said. However, 'what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh'—for, while He assumed flesh, He by no means took on sin—'hath condemned sin in the flesh. That the justification of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not according to the flesh, but according to the spirit,' for 'the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity,' and gives strength to the law of our mind against the law which is in our members. 'For we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit himself asketh for us with unspeakable groanings,'³ that is to say, He teaches us what we should pray for. Hence, it is impossible to observe the commandments of the Lord except by patience and prayer.

Chapter 23

The seventh day was called the Sabbath and it means rest, for on it God 'rested from all his work,'¹ as sacred Scripture has it. And it is for this reason that the numbering of the days goes up as far as seven and then starts over

³ Rom. 8.3,4,26.

¹ Gen. 2.2.

again from one. This number is held in honor by the Jews, because God prescribed that it be honored—not in any casual way, but under the most severe sanctions in case of violation.² What is more, He did not prescribe this arbitrarily, but for certain reasons which are perceptible in a mystic sense to spiritual and discerning men.³

At any rate, to start with the inferior and grosser things, as my unlearned self understands it, when God saw the grossness and sensuality of the people of Israel and their absolute propensity for material things, as well as their indiscretion, then first of all He prescribed that 'the man-servant and the ox should rest,'⁴ as it is written. This was because 'the just regardeth the lives of his beasts,'⁵ but at the same time it was in order that they might rest from the distraction of material things and congregate to God to spend the entire seventh day 'in psalms, hymns and spiritual canticles,'⁶ in the study of sacred Scripture, and in taking rest in God. For, when there was no law or divinely inspired Scripture, neither was the Sabbath consecrated to God; but when the divinely inspired Scripture was given through Moses, then the Sabbath was consecrated to God, so that on that day such might have leisure to study it as do not consecrate their entire lives to God nor with longing serve the Lord as Father but like unfeeling servants—the kind who, if ever they do allot some short and very small part of their lives to God, do so from fear of the punishment and chastisement attendant upon its violation. For 'the law is not made for the just man but for the unjust.'⁷ Moses was the first to wait upon God for forty days fasting, and again for another forty days,⁸ and, when he did so, he most certainly mortified

2 E.g., Num. 15.32-36.

3 Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 41.2 (PG 36.429).

4 Deut. 5.14.

5 Prov. 12.10.

6 Col. 3.16.

7 1 Tim. 1.9.

8 Cf. Exod. 24.18; 34.28.

himself with fasting on the Sabbaths, although the law prescribed that they should not mortify themselves on the Sabbath day. However, should they say that this happened before the Law, then what will they have to say about Elias the Thesbite who made a forty-day journey on one meal?⁹ For this man broke the Sabbath by afflicting himself on the Sabbaths of those forty days not only with fasting, but with traveling, and God, who had given the Law, was not angry with him, but on the contrary appeared to him on Horeb as a reward for virtue. And what will they say about Daniel? Did he not go for three weeks without food?¹⁰ And what about all Israel? Do they not circumcise a child on the Sabbath, if the eighth day happens to fall on it? And also, do they not keep the great fast, which is ordained by law, if it comes on the Sabbath? And also, do not the priests and levites profane the Sabbath in the works of the tabernacle, yet remain without blame?¹¹ More than that, should a beast fall into a pit on the Sabbath, he who pulls it out is without blame, while he who neglects it is condemned.¹² And what about all Israel? Did they not circle about the walls of Jericho carrying the ark for seven days, on one of which the Sabbath most certainly fell?¹³

And so, as I said, for the sake of leisure time for God, in order that they might devote at least a minimum portion to Him and that their man-servant and beast might rest, the observance of the Sabbath was imposed upon them while still 'children and serving under the elements of the world,'¹⁴ carnal and unable to understand anything beyond the body and the letter. 'But when the fulness of time was come, God sent His only-begotten Son, made man of a woman, made under the law; that he might redeem them who are

9 Cf. 3 Kings 19.8.

10 Cf. Dan. 10.2,3.

11 Cf. Matt. 12.5.

12 Cf. Luke 14.5.

13 Cf. Josue 6.4.

14 Gal. 4.3.

under the law: that we might receive the adoption of sons.¹⁵ For as many of us as received Him, He gave power to be made the sons of God, to those that believe in Him.¹⁶ And so we are no longer servants, but sons.¹⁷ We are no longer under the Law, but under grace.¹⁸ We no longer give the Lord just partial service out of fear, but we are bound to dedicate the whole space of our life to Him and constantly to make the man-servant, by which I mean anger and desire, desist from sin, while at the same time turning him to the service of God. And while we constantly raise up all our desire to God, our anger we arm against His enemies. And the beast of burden, that is to say, our body, we release from the servitude of sin, while at the same time we urge it onto the fullest observance of the divine commandments.

These things the spiritual law of Christ enjoins upon us, and they who keep this law are become superior to the Law of Moses. For, since 'that which is perfect is come, that which is in part is done away,' and since the covering of the Law, the veil, that is to say, was rent because of the crucifixion of the Saviour and the Spirit was radiant with tongues of fire,¹⁹ the letter is done away, the things of the body have ceased, the law of servitude has been fulfilled, and the law of freedom has been given us. And we celebrate the complete adjustment of human nature, by which I mean the day of the resurrection upon which the Lord Jesus, the Author of life and Saviour, admitted us to the portion promised them that worship God in the spirit, into which He entered as our precursor when He rose from the dead and, with the gates of heaven opened to Him, sat down corporeally at the right hand of the Father, where they also shall enter who keep the law of the Spirit.

¹⁵ Gal. 4.4,5.

¹⁶ John 1.12.

¹⁷ Cf. Gal. 4.7.

¹⁸ Cf. Rom. 6.14.

¹⁹ 1 Cor. 13.10; Matt. 27.51; Acts 2.3.

We, then, who follow the spirit and not the letter must put aside all things of the flesh and worship in the spirit and be joined with God. For circumcision is really the putting aside of bodily pleasure and superfluous unnecessary things, since the foreskin is nothing more than a piece of skin, a superfluous part of the pleasurable member. Moreover, any pleasure which is not from God and in God is a pleasure, the figure of which is the foreskin. The Sabbath, moreover, is the desisting from sin. Hence, both amount to the same thing, and when both are observed together in this way by those who are spiritual, they induce no violation of the law whatsoever.

One must furthermore know that the number seven signifies all the present time,²⁰ as the most wise Solomon says: 'Give a portion to seven, and also to eight.'²¹ Also, when the inspired David was singing a psalm for the octave, he sang of the state of things to be after the resurrection from the dead.²² Therefore, when the Law prescribed that bodily things be refrained from on the seventh day and time devoted to the spiritual, it intimated to the true Israel, the Israel which has a mind that sees God, that it should devote itself to God at all times and rise up above the things of the body.

Chapter 24

Men who are carnal and given to pleasure belittle virginity and offer by way of testimony the saying, 'Cursed be every man who raiseth not up seed in Israel.'¹ But we, made confident by the fact that God the Word took flesh of a virgin, declare that virginity is from above and was implanted in men's nature from the beginning. Thus, man

²⁰ Cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *Sermon* 45.15 (PG 36.644C).

²¹ Eccle. 11.2.

²² Cf. Ps. 6.11.

¹ Cf. Deut. 25.5-10.

was formed from the virgin earth. Eve was created from Adam alone. Virginity was practiced in paradise. Indeed, sacred Scripture says that 'they were naked, to wit, Adam and Eve: and were not ashamed.'² However, once they had fallen, they knew that they were naked and being ashamed they sewed together aprons for themselves.³ After the fall, when Adam heard 'Dust thou art, and unto dust return,' and death entered into the world through transgression, then 'Adam knew Eve his wife: who conceived and brought forth.'⁴ And so to keep the race from dwindling and being destroyed by death marriage was devised, so that by the begetting of children the race of men might be preserved.⁵

But they may ask: What, then, does 'male and female' mean, and 'increase and multiply'?⁶ To which we shall reply that the 'increase and multiply' does not mean increasing by the marriage union exclusively, because, if they had kept the commandment unbroken forever, God could have increased the race by some other means. But, since God, who knows all things before they come to be, saw by His foreknowledge how they were to fall and be condemned to death, He made provision beforehand by creating them male and female and commanding them to increase and multiply. So let us continue along the road and see what the increments from virginity are, which is nothing else than to talk about chastity.

When Noe was ordered to enter the ark and was entrusted with the safeguarding of the seed of the earth, he was given this command, which reads: 'Go in thou and thy sons, and thy wife, and the wives of thy sons.'⁷ He separated them from their wives, so that with the help of chastity they

² Gen. 2.25.

³ Cf. Gen. 3.7.

⁴ Gen. 3.19; cf. Rom. 5.12; Gen. 4.1.

⁵ Cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Making of Man* 17 (PG 44.188-189).

⁶ Gen. 1.27,28.

⁷ Gen. 7.1; 6.18.

might escape the deep and that world-wide destruction. However, after the cessation of the flood, the command was: 'Go out thou and thy wife, thy sons, and the wives of thy sons.'⁸ Here, see how marriage was again permitted for the sake of increase. And, then, did not Elias, who rode up to heaven in a fiery chariot,⁹ embrace celibacy and was not approval of this shown by his being endowed with a superiority over men? Who closed the heavens? Who raised the dead? Who divided the Jordan?¹⁰ Was it not Elias the virgin? And did not Eliseus, his disciple, ask for the grace of his spirit in double, and receive it, when he displayed equal virtue?¹¹ And what about the three children? Was it not by practicing virginity that they became stronger than the fire, because by virginity their bodies had become impregnable to fire? Was there not a Daniel, whose body the teeth of wild beasts could not penetrate, because it had been hardened by virginity?¹² When God was about to appear to the Israelites, did He not enjoin them to keep their bodies pure?¹³ Did not priests purify themselves and thus enter the sanctuary and offer sacrifices?¹⁴ Did not the Law proclaim chastity to be a great vow?

Thus, the prescription of the Law must be taken in the more spiritual sense. For there is a spiritual seed which through charity and the fear of God is conceived in the womb of the soul, which in turn travails and brings forth the spirit of salvation. It is in this sense that the passage is to be taken which reads: 'Blessed is he who has seed in Sion and kindred in Jerusalem.'¹⁵ What, indeed! Even though one be a fornicator, a drunkard, or an idolater, will he be

8 Gen. 8.16.

9 Cf. 4 Kings 2.11.

10 Cf. 3 Kings 17.1; 17.22; 4 Kings 2.8.

11 Cf. 4 Kings 2.9,14.

12 Cf. Dan. 3.50; 6.22.

13 Cf. Exod. 19.15.

14 Cf. Lev. 21.

15 Isa. 31.9 (Septuagint).

blessed, provided only that he has seed in Sion and kindred in Jerusalem? No one in his right mind would say that.

Virginity is the habitual state of the angels, the peculiar characteristic of every incorporeal nature. We are not saying all this to decry marriage, God forbid, because we know that the Lord blessed marriage by His presence,¹⁶ and we know the passage which says: 'marriage honorable and the bed undefiled.'¹⁷ We do, however, know that virginity is better than good. For with the virtues, as well as with the vices, there are greater and lesser degrees. We do know that, with the exception of the first parents of the race, all mortals are offspring from marriage, for our first parents were the work of virginity and not of marriage. Celibacy, however, is an imitation of the angels, as we have said. So, virginity is as much more honorable than marriage as the angel is superior to man. But what am I saying—an angel? Christ Himself is the glory of virginity, not only because He was begotten of the Father without beginning, without change, and without coition, but also because, when He became man like us, He for our sake took flesh of a virgin without any carnal union and exhibited in Himself the true and perfect virginity. But He did not make this a law for us, because 'all men take not this word,'¹⁸ as He Himself said. He did, however, instruct us by His example and give us the strength to keep virginity, for to whom is it not clear that virginity is being observed among men now?

The begetting of children which results from marriage is certainly good. Marriage, too, is good, because it does away with fornication and by licit intercourse prevents the frenzy of concupiscence from being excited to illicit actions.¹⁹ Marriage is good for those for whom continence is impossible, but virginity is better, because it increases the fecundity of

16 Cf. John 2.2.

17 Heb. 13.4.

18 Matt. 19.11.

19 Cf. 1 Cor. 7.2.

the soul and offers prayer to God as a seasonable fruit. 'Marriage honourable, and the bed undefiled. For fornicators and adulterers God will judge.'²⁰

Chapter 25

The circumcision was given to Abraham before the Law, after the blessings and after the promise, as a sign to set him and those born of him and those of his household apart from the Gentiles in whose midst he was living.¹ And this is obvious, because, when Israel spent forty years alone by themselves in the desert without mixing with any other nation, all those who were born in the desert were not circumcised.² However, when Josue brought them across the Jordan, they were circumcised and a second law of circumcision was made. For, under Abraham a law of circumcision was given, and then it was inoperative for forty years in the desert. Then, after the crossing of the Jordan, God again gave the law for a second time, as is written in the book of Josue, son of Nave: 'At that time the Lord said to Josue: make thee knives of stone from the sharpest rock, and sitting down circumcise the second time the children of Israel'; and a little further on: 'for during forty-two years Israel dwelt in the wilderness of Midbar, and for this reason very many were uncircumcised of the sons of the fighting men who had come out of Egypt, who had disobeyed the commandments of God and to whom he declared that they should not see the good land which he had sworn to give to their fathers, the land flowing with milk and honey. The children of these he made to succeed in their place whom Josue circumcised

²⁰ Heb. 13.4.

¹ Cf. Gen. 12; 13; 15; 17.10-14.

² John Chrysostom, *Homily 39 on Genesis 4* (PG 53.366).

because of their not having been circumcised in the way.³ Hence, circumcision was a sign by which Israel was set apart from the Gentiles among whom they lived.

Now, this was a figure of baptism,⁴ for, just as circumcision cuts off from the body a part which is not useful, but a useless superfluity, so by holy baptism are we circumcised of sin. It is obvious that sin is a superfluity of concupiscence and of no use. For it is impossible for anyone not to have any concupiscence at all or to be entirely without any taste for pleasure, but the useless part of pleasure, that is to say, the useless concupiscence and pleasure, this is the sin which holy baptism circumcises. And holy baptism gives us the sign of the venerable cross upon our forehead but does not set us apart from the Gentiles, for all the Gentiles have attained baptism and have been sealed with the sign of the cross. It does, however, distinguish the faithful in each nation from the infidel. Therefore, now that the truth has been made manifest, its figure and shadow is of no use. And so, to be circumcised is now superfluous and a contradiction of holy baptism, for 'he who circumciseth himself is a debtor to the whole law.'⁵ The Lord, however, was circumcised that He might fulfill the Law. He also kept the Law in all things and observed the Sabbath that He might fulfill the Law and make it stand. But from the time when He was baptized and men saw the Holy Ghost coming down upon Him in the form of a dove, from that time on the spiritual worship and polity and the kingdom of heaven have been proclaimed.

Chapter 26

One should know that the Antichrist must come. Antichrist, to be sure, is everyone who does not confess that the Son of

³ Josue 5.2; 5.6-7 (Septuagint).

⁴ Cf. Athanasius, *On Sabbaths and the Circumcision* (PG 28.141BC)

⁵ Gal. 5.3.

God came in the flesh, is perfect God, and became perfect man while at the same time He was God.¹ In a peculiar and special sense, however, he who is to come at the consummation of the world is called Antichrist.² So, it is first necessary for the Gospel to have been preached to all the Gentiles, as the Lord said,³ and then he shall come unto conviction of the impious Jews. For the Lord said to them: 'I am come in the name of my Father, and you receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him you will receive.'⁴ And the Apostle: 'Because they receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. Therefore God shall send them the operation of error, to believe lying: that all may be judged who have not believed the truth but have consented to iniquity.'⁵ Hence, the Jews did not receive the Lord Jesus Christ and God, although He was the Son of God, but the deceiver who says that he is God they will receive.⁶ For, that he will call himself God the angel who taught Daniel thus declares: 'He shall make no account of the gods of his fathers.'⁷ And the Apostle: 'Let no man deceive you by any means; for unless there come a revolt first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and is lifted up above all that is called God or that is worshipped, so that he sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself as if he were God.'⁸ 'In the temple of God,' he says—not, however, in ours, but in the former one, that of the Jews, for he will not come to us, but to the Jews—not for the sake of Christ and Christ's, for which reason, also, he is called Antichrist.⁹

The Gospel, then, must first be preached in all nations,

1 Cf. 1 John 4.3.

2 Cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Discourse* 15 12 (PG 33.885AB).

3 Cf. Matt. 24.14.

4 John 5.43.

5 2 Thess. 2.10,11.

6 Cf. John Chrysostom, *Homily 4 on 2 Thessalonians* 1 (PG 62.487).

7 Dan. 11.37 (Septuagint).

8 2 Thess. 2.3,4.

9 Cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *op. cit.* 11 (PG 33.884-885).

‘and then that wicked one shall be revealed: whose coming is according to the working of Satan, in all power and signs and lying wonders, in all seduction of iniquity to them that perish: whom the Lord shall kill with the words of his mouth and shall destroy with the coming of his brightness.’¹⁰ Thus, the Devil does not himself become man after the manner of the incarnation of the Lord—God forbid!—but a man is born of fornication and receives into himself the whole operation of Satan, for God permits the Devil to inhabit him, because He foresees the future perversity of his will.¹¹

So, he is born of fornication, as we said, and is brought up unnoticed; but of a sudden he rises up, revolts, and rules. During the first part of his reign—of his tyranny, rather—he plays more the part of sanctity; but when he gains complete control, he persecutes the Church of God and reveals all his wickedness. And he shall come ‘in signs and lying wonders’¹²—sham ones and not real—and he will seduce those whose intention rests on a rotten and unstable foundation and make them abandon the living God, ‘inasmuch as to scandalize (if possible) even the elect.’¹³

And Enoch and Elias the Thesbite will be sent and they shall ‘turn the heart of the fathers to the children,’¹⁴ that is to say, turn the synagogue to our Lord Jesus Christ and the preaching of the Apostles. And they will be destroyed by him. Then the Lord will come from heaven in the same way that the holy Apostles saw Him going into heaven, perfect God and perfect man, with glory and power; and He shall destroy the man of iniquity, the son of perdition, with the spirit of His mouth.¹⁵ So, let no one expect the Lord to come from the earth, but from heaven, as He Himself has positively assured us.

10 2 Thess. 2.8-10.

11 Cf. John Chrysostom, *Hom. 3 on 2 Thess. 2*, (PG 62.482).

12 2 Thess. 2.9.

13 Matt. 24.24.

14 Mal. 4.6.

15 Cf. Acts 1.11; 2 Thess. 2.8.

Chapter 27

Furthermore, we also believe in the resurrection of the dead, for there really will be one, there will be a resurrection of the dead. Now, when we say resurrection, we mean a resurrection of bodies. For resurrection is a raising up again of one who has fallen. But, since souls are immortal, how shall they rise again? Well if death is defined as a separation of soul from body, the resurrection is the perfect rejoining of soul and body, and the raising up again of the dissolved and fallen animal.¹ Therefore, the very body which is corrupted and dissolved will itself rise up incorruptible. For He who formed it in the beginning from the slime of the earth is not incapable of raising it up again after it has again been dissolved and returned to the earth whence it was taken by the decision of its Creator.

Now, if there is no resurrection, let us eat and drink² and lead a life of pleasure and enjoyment. If there is no resurrection, then how do we differ from brute beasts? If there is no resurrection, let us call the beasts of the field blessed, because their life is free from care. If there is no resurrection, there is no God and no providence, and all things are being driven and carried along by mere chance. For just consider how very many just men we see in need and suffering injury, yet getting no recompense in this present life, whereas we see sinners and wicked men possessing wealth and every luxury in abundance. Who in his right mind would understand this to be the work of righteous judgment or wise providence? Therefore, there will be, there certainly will be, a resurrection. For God is just and He rewards those who await Him in patience. Now, if the soul had engaged alone in the contest for virtue, then it would also be crowned alone; and if it alone had indulged in pleasures, then it alone

1 Cf. Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 88 (PG 43.180); Methodius, *On the Resurrection* (PG 18.285).

2 Cf. 1 Cor. 15.32; Isa. 22.13.

could be justly punished. However, since the soul followed neither virtue nor vice without the body, it will be just for them to receive their recompense together.

Moreover, sacred Scripture, too, testifies to the fact that there will be a resurrection of the body. Indeed, God says to Noe after the flood: 'Even as the green herbs have I delivered them all to you: saving that flesh with blood of its life you shall not eat. And I will require your blood of your lives, at the hand of every beast I will require it. And at the hand of every man I will require the life of his brother. Whosoever shall shed man's blood, for that blood his blood shall be shed: for I made man to the image of God.'³ How can He require the blood of man at the hand of every beast, unless He raise the bodies of men who die? For beasts will not die in the place of men.

And again to Moses: 'I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob.'⁴ God 'is not the God of the dead,'⁵ of those who have died and will never be again. Rather, He is the God of the living, whose souls live in His hand,⁶ and whose bodies will by the resurrection live again. And David, the ancestor of God, says to God: 'Thou shalt take away their breath, and they shall fail, and shall return to their dust.' See how it is a question of their bodies. Then he adds: Thou shalt send forth thy spirit, and they shall be created: and thou shalt renew the face of the earth.'⁷

And Isaias also: 'The dead shall rise and those in their graves be awakened.'⁸ And it is obvious that it is not the souls that are put in the tombs but the bodies.

And the blessed Ezechiel also: 'And it came to pass as I prophesied, and behold a commotion. And the bones came

³ Gen. 9.3-6 (Septuagint).

⁴ Exod. 3.6.

⁵ Matt. 22.32.

⁶ Cf. Wisd. 3.1.

⁷ Ps. 103.29,30.

⁸ Isa. 26.19 (Septuagint).

together, bone to bone, each one to its joint. And I saw, and behold the sinews and the flesh came upon them, and spread over them, and the skin was stretched out over them.⁹ Then he relates how the spirits were commanded and returned.

And the divine Daniel, also: 'And at that time shall Michael rise up, the great prince, who standeth for the children of thy people: and a time of tribulation shall come such as never was from the time that nations began on the earth even until that time. And at that time shall thy people be saved, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of those that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake: some unto life everlasting, and others unto reproach and everlasting shame. And they that are learned shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and from the many just, as stars for all eternity and still they shall shine.'¹⁰ When he says 'many of those that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake,' it is clear that he means the resurrection of their bodies, for I do not suppose that anyone would speak of souls sleeping in the dust of the earth.

There is, moreover, no doubt that the Lord, too, has very clearly shown in the holy Gospels that there is a resurrection of the body, for 'they that are in the graves,' He says, 'shall hear the voice of the Son of God. And they that have done good things shall come forth unto the resurrection of life: but they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment.'¹¹ Now, no person in his right mind would ever say that it was the souls that were in the graves.

And it was not only in word that He brought out the resurrection, but also in deed. First of all, He raised Lazarus who was four days dead and already putrified and stinking.¹² It was not a soul devoid of a body that He raised, but a

⁹ Ezech. 37.7,8 (Septuagint)

¹⁰ Dan. 12.1-3 (Septuagint).

¹¹ John 5.28,29.

¹² Cf. John 11.

body with its soul—not another body, but the same one which had putrified. For how would one know or believe in the resurrection of one who had died, were it not for the proof offered by his characteristic peculiarities? Moreover, He also raised Lazarus, who was to return to death again, to show His own divinity and to give assurance of His and our resurrection. And then the Lord Himself became the first-fruits of the perfect resurrection which will never be subject to death. That is why the divine Apostle Paul said: ‘If the dead rise not again, neither is Christ risen again. And if Christ be not risen again, our faith is vain, for we are yet in our sins’; and: ‘Because Christ is risen, the first-fruits of them that sleep’; and ‘firstborn from the dead’; and again: ‘For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again: even so them who have slept through Jesus, will God bring with him.’¹³ ‘Even so,’ he said, ‘as the Lord has risen.’

And it is plain that the resurrection of the Lord was the uniting of a soul with an incorrupted body, for these had been separated, because He said: ‘Destroy this temple; and in three days I will raise it up.’¹⁴ And the holy Gospel is a trusty witness to the fact that He was here speaking of His own body. ‘Handle me and see,’ the Lord said to His own disciples, who thought that they were seeing a spirit, ‘that it is myself, and that I am not different, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me to have.’ And when He had said this, He showed them His hands and His side and He held them out to Thomas to touch.¹⁵ Now, are not these things a sufficient guarantee of the resurrection?

Again, the divine Apostle says: ‘For this corruptible must put on incorruption: and this mortal must put on immortality’; and again ‘It is sown in corruption: it shall rise in incorruption. It is sown in weakness: it shall rise in power. It is sown in dishonour: it shall rise in glory. It is sown a

¹³ 1 Cor. 15.16,17,20; Col. 1.18; 1 Thess. 4.13.

¹⁴ John 2.19,21.

¹⁵ Luke 24.39,40; John 20.27.

natural body (which is to say, gross and mortal): it shall rise a spiritual body.¹⁶ Such was the body of the Lord after the resurrection, the same which entered through the closed doors without difficulty and which needed neither food, nor sleep, nor drink. 'For they shall be,' says the Lord, 'like the angels of God,'¹⁷ and there shall no longer be marriage or begetting of children. Indeed, the divine Apostle says: 'But our conversation is in heaven: from whence also we look for the Saviour, our Lord Jesus Christ, who will reform the body of our lowliness, unto its being made like to the body of his glory,'¹⁸ not meaning a transformation into another form—far be it!—but rather a change from corruption to incorruption.

'But some man will say: How do the dead rise again?' Oh, what lack of faith! Oh, what stupidity! He who just by His will changed dust into a body and ordained that a little drop of seed should grow up in the womb to make this complex and multiform organ which is the body, will He not much more be able to raise up again the body which has already been made and then wasted away, just by willing it? 'Or with what manner of body shall they come?' Senseless man, if thou art callous enough not to believe the words of God, then at least believe His works, for 'that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die first. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body which shall be: but bare grain, as of wheat, or some of the rest. But God giveth it a body as he will: and to every seed its proper body.'¹⁹ Consider, then, the seeds that are buried in the furrows as in graves. Who is it that engrafts roots upon them, stem and leaves and ear and those most delicate tassels. It is not the Creator of them all? Is this not done by the command of Him who fashioned all things? Then believe thus: that the

16 1 Cor. 15.53,42-44.

17 Mark 12.25.

18 Phil. 3.20,21.

19 1 Cor. 15.35-38.

resurrection of the dead also will come about by the divine will and sanction. For He has the power to correspond with His will.

And so, with our souls again united to our bodies, which will have become incorrupt and put off corruption, we shall rise again and stand before the terrible judgment seat of Christ.²⁰ And the Devil and his demons, and his man, which is to say, the Antichrist, and the impious and sinners will be given over to everlasting fire,²¹ which will not be a material fire such as we are accustomed to, but a fire such as God might know. And those who have done good will shine like the sun together with the angels unto eternal life with our Lord Jesus Christ, ever seeing Him and being seen, enjoying the unending bliss which is from Him, and praising Him together with the Father and the Holy Ghost unto the endless ages of ages. Amen.

²⁰ Cf. Rom. 14.10.

²¹ Cf. Matt. 25.41.